





Antitrinitarian Biography :

OR

SKETCHES OF THE LIVES AND WRITINGS

OF

DISTINGUISHED ANTITRINITARIANS;

EXHIBITING A VIEW OF THE

AS

STATE OF THE UNITARIAN DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP IN

THE PRINCIPAL NATIONS OF EUROPE,

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE CLOSE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY:

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

A HISTORY OF UNITARIANISM IN ENGLAND

DURING THE SAME PERIOD.

BY

ROBERT WALLACE, F.G.S.,

AND

MEMBER OF THE HISTORICO-THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LEIPZIG.



IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON :

E. T. WHITFIELD, 2, ESSEX STREET, STRAND.

1850.

ANTITRINITARIAN BIOGRAPHY.

PART II.

ANTITRINITARIAN BIOGRAPHY.

7.

STEPHEN DOLET, the friend and disciple of Servetus, was born at Orleans, in 1509; and is said to have been a natural son of Francis I., King of France, by Madame Cureau. He studied first at Paris, and afterwards at Padua and Venice. About the year 1532, he left Italy, and returned to France. He then studied at Toulouse, where his irregularity, and want of respect for his superiors, involved him in no small trouble; and led at last to his imprisonment. After a month's incarceration he was liberated; but being suspected of a leaning towards Lutheranism, and even charged with Atheism and impiety, he was expelled. He then went to Lyons, where he was employed, as a corrector of the press, by Sebastian Gryphius. In 1534, he removed to Paris; but he returned to Lyons in 1536, where he commenced the business of a printer and bookseller.

His literary labours procured for him the friendship of some of the most learned of his contemporaries: but by the freedom of his remarks, he incurred the censure and dislike of others. Calvin classes him with Servetus, and Cornelius Agrippa; and calls them Cyclops, and notorious despisers of the Gospel. Dolet's acquaintance with Servetus was formed during the residence of the latter at Lyons;

and he not only became a convert to the opinions of Servetus, but a zealous propagator of them. He was in the habit of sending heretical books to Paris, of which indiscretion his enemies took advantage, to involve him in a charge of infidelity.

In 1539, he accidentally killed a man, which rendered it necessary for him to quit Lyons. Some time after this, he was arrested, and thrown into prison; but he was liberated, at the intercession of his friends, on giving a promise that he would in future lead the life of a good Catholic. He failed, however, to perform this promise; and was again imprisoned in 1544. On this occasion he made his escape, and fled into Piedmont; but imprudently returning shortly afterwards, he was seized, and tried on a charge of Atheism, for which he was sentenced to be burnt alive, in the thirty-seventh year of his age.

This sentence was carried into effect at the Place Maubert, in Paris, on the 3rd of August, (St. Stephen's day,) 1546; and was the precursor of that of his friend Servetus, which took place about seven years later. It is said that, on his way to the place of punishment, when he saw that his fate excited the commiseration of the multitude, he composed the following verse:

Non dolet ipse Dolet, sed pia turba dolet;—

to which the Priest, who accompanied him, replied, by a transposition of the same words,

Non pia turba dolet, sed dolet ipse Dolet.

He wrote and published several works in Latin and French, chiefly of a literary kind. Many of these are works of great rarity, and are seldom found in libraries. Some are in verse, and display considerable talent: but there was a degree of indelicacy in Dolet's epigrams, which made him many enemies. To a volume of Poems in four Books,

published in 4to., A.D. 1538, are subjoined the following complimentary verses, by one of his admirers.

Inter Latinos est Poetas maximus,
Virgilius : inter Rhetores est *Tullius*.
 Lumen *Doletus* universæ Galliæ
 Utrumque si non vincit, exæquat tamen.

A list of his writings may be seen in Bock's "Historia Antitrinitariorum." They are seventeen in number; but few of them are on religious subjects. About four years before his death, he translated into French the Paraphrase of John Campanus on the Books of Psalms and Ecclesiastes, which was anything but the act of an Atheist. He likewise wrote, in the same language,

1. The Christian Knight;
 2. An Exhortation to the Reading of the Scriptures;
- and
3. Biblical Prayers: and he published, in 1541,
 4. An Explanation of the Lord's Prayer, in Latin.

The name of Dolet does not occur in Sandius's list of Antitrinitarians; but Bock notices him both in the biographical and historical part of his work, and in the former gives a detailed account of his published writings. He was a less estimable man than Servetus; and his history does not carry with it the sympathy of the reader in the same degree, although both were sufferers in the same cause. This is in some measure owing to the levity, with which he did not scruple to treat the superstitious notions of the day; and which led his contemporaries to regard him as an Atheist.

VIDEND. Bock, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 245—250; T. II. pp. 313—315. Moreri, Grand. Dict. Hist. Art. DOLET. Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. DOLET. Vogt, Catal. Libror. Rarior. pp. 239—242. Walchii Bibl. Theol. T. IV. pp. 502, 503.

8.

CLAUDE OF SAVOY first appeared in the character of a religious reformer at Bern, in Switzerland, and, by his bold and startling doctrines, created a great sensation among the citizens of that republic. Simler and others apply to him the epithet ALLOBROX; but Berchtoldt Haller, in a letter dated May 7th, 1534, calls him GALLUS, a *Frenchman*. Schellhorn has attempted to reconcile the apparent discrepancy, by mentioning the fact, that the Allobroges, inhabiting the Pays de Vaud, the Genevese, and other inhabitants of the neighbouring territory, spoke the French language. It would appear, that Claude had acted in a military capacity, before he commenced religious reformer; for Stupanus says, that Cœlius Secundus Curio took refuge in a town, near Moncaglieri, called "*Ramonisium*, of which one Claude of Savoy had the command."

Claude was a follower of Servetus, whose opinions he disseminated in Savoy, Switzerland, Suabia and Bavaria. The Pastors of Bern endeavoured to bring him over to a belief in the præexistence and divinity of Christ, by an appeal to the writings of the New Testament; but he could not be prevailed upon to make any further admission, than that Christ was the Son of God by nature, and in that sense God himself. He persisted in denying Christ's existence from eternity; and contended that he was born in time, although in a miraculous manner, of the Virgin Mary. He said that Christ præexisted in the eternal decree of God, not in reality, but in idea only; and that it is purely as a man that he is an object of our faith. From this point the Pastors of Bern were unable to move him: but they insisted upon his keeping these views to himself, and in a few weeks afterwards he left their canton. On this occasion Bullinger composed a treatise in defence of the two natures in Christ, with the double object of preventing the

spread of Claude's opinions, and asserting the orthodoxy of the Swiss Churches.

Disappointed at the opposition which he had to encounter in Switzerland, Claude now resolved to visit Germany; and on his road he passed through Basle, where he had an interview with Oswald Myconius. But he was arrested, and sent summarily away. On being released, he withdrew to Wittenberg, for the purpose of conversing with Luther, and his friends: but there also he found the recollection of John Campanus too fresh in men's minds, to allow him any chance of success, in promoting the particular object which he had in view. After a stay of some months, therefore, during which he was employed in propagating his opinions among those who were willing to listen to him, he was warned to take his departure, and returned to the north of Italy, in the year 1537. Beza informs us, in the Preface to his "*History of Valentine Gentilis*," that Claude, after some stay in Italy, returned into Germany. At Augsburg he succeeded in procuring a few followers; but when the circumstance became known, he was arrested, and compelled to quit the city without delay. Caspar Schwenckfeldt, in a letter addressed to the brethren at Augsburg and Strasburg, in 1542, warns them, in the strongest terms, against the Antitrinitarian opinions of Claude.

We find him next at Constance, where he conducted himself so discreetly, as to gain the friendship of Ambrose Blaurer. But though he refrained from conversing on his favourite topics, he hesitated not to commit his thoughts to writing. In a treatise, the contents of which Martin Frecht subsequently communicated to his friends at Constance, occurs the following statement of Claude's opinions, written by himself. " 'The Lord thy God is one.' Whence then are there two others? particularly since it is written,

‘Who hath been his counsellor?’ That man alone, whom Mary conceived and brought forth, is called *the Son of God*. Thus, the angels sang concerning him, ‘This day is born a Saviour of the world:’ they did not however say, ‘This day a God is born.’ But if Jesus is thus divided into God and man, the Virgin would not be the mother of Christ, but only of a part of him. Observe also the expression ‘this day,’ which indicates a definite time. He was not, therefore, begotten eternally of the Father, as they falsely imagine. It is likewise sufficiently shewn, by the declaration ‘he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham,’ that the Father, wishing to reconcile the world to himself, willed to do this by a creature, and by blood, and not by any divinity. It is not said, that he took on him a sonship, which had existed from eternity, but only the seed of Abraham. I confess, however, that Jesus Christ is God in that manner, in which he himself said that he was. If he called those gods, to whom the word of God came, how much more him, whom the Father sanctified; who received the Holy Spirit above his fellows, so that all might receive it through him from the Father. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth, and that he alone was from eternity; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. I believe that he was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and born of a virgin, and at a given time; but not therefore from eternity. I believe also in the Spirit, but not in God the Holy Ghost. In short, I do not believe, that three persons are one God; but I know that they are three men. Three persons are three men, and not one God.” Frecht adds, that Claude further expresses himself thus: “Christ is from eternity in the Word,—in promise. He was also before Abraham in dignity, as John the Baptist says concerning him, Mark iii. But he was not Christ in that

[Word?] from eternity. He was Christ in Mary : before that he was nothing. God also is one from eternity, and was not the Father from eternity ; for he became a Father, when he created men and Christ. It is said, ‘ In the beginning was the word.’ Christ is the word ; that is, the speaking word. It is also said, ‘ the word became flesh ;’ and no one denies that the word which God spoke, which he promised, became flesh.”

About the year 1550, as we learn from Schelhorn, Claude was at Memmingen, where he endeavoured to persuade some of the inhabitants, that the Virgin Mary bore many sons besides Christ ; that there are not three persons in one essence ; that the Father alone is the true God, and is greater than the Son ; and that the Scriptures have been corrupted, particularly John i. 1, the true reading of the last clause of which, he contended, was, “ and the word was God’s.” The same conjecture was afterwards revived by Samuel Crellius, with whom it is supposed by many to have originated ; but having the authority of no manuscript, or version in its favour, it meets with few advocates among the Unitarians of the present day.

Claude further said, that the truth was not yet brought to light, but that it would at length be rescued, by himself, from the obscurity in which it lay. He pretended also to be able to interpret dreams, and predict future events ; and denounced judgment upon all Cities and Magistrates, that did not believe in him. But he was banished from the town ; and efforts were made to convince his followers of their errors. These facts Schelhorn professes to have learnt from public documents. But the same writer informs us, that it required no less than five years of incessant labour, on the part of the Pastors of Memmingen, and of Ludwig Rab, an eminent Theologian, who was brought from Ulm to Memmingen expressly for the purpose, to re-convert

those, whom Claude had succeeded in bringing over to his own opinions.

After the year 1555, we hear nothing more of him; and the time and place of his death are buried in the same impenetrable obscurity as those of his birth.

Caspar Schwenckfeldt speaks of him as the founder of one of the Anabaptist sects, which took from him the name of *Claudians*; and says that by *the Logos*, in John's Gospel, he understood the idea of the redemption of the world, conceived in the Divine Mind. The middle clause of John i. 1,—“the word was with God,”—he interpreted, “*Deus secum decrevit*” (God determined with himself); and the first clause in verse 14,—“the word was made flesh,”—“*Deus decretum suum perfecit, et manifestum reddidit*” (God accomplished his decree, and made it manifest).

None of the writings of Claude remain; but Schwenckfeldt, Haller and Bullinger, have all given separate and independent accounts of his opinions.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 103—106; T. II. pp. 298—300. 308. 409. 415, 416. *Trechsel*, Mich. Servet und seine Vorgänger, S. 56—59. *Epistolæ ab Eccles. Helv. Reformatoribus, vel ad eos scriptæ*, Cent. i. p. 139. *Schelhornii* Diss. Epistolæ. de Mino Celso Senensi, Ulmæ, 1718, pp. 71—77. *Amoen. Literar.* T. XIV. p. 337; T. XI. pp. 91, 92.

9.

JOHN (or JUAN) VALDEZ, (sometimes written VALDESSO, or VAL D'ESSE,) occupies the second place in the “*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*” of Sandius, who gives the following brief account of him. “JOHN VALDEZ, a Spanish Noble, a Civilian, and Secretary to the King of Naples, is reported to have brought with him from Germany to Naples the writings of Luther, Bucer, and the Anabaptists. Bernardine Ochinus is said to have imbibed from him his opinion against the received doctrine of the Trinity. He flourished in the year 1542. The Ministers of the united

Churches of Poland and Transylvania, Bk. 1, Ch. 3, ‘On a false and true Knowledge of the One God the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,’ write thus. ‘Why should we speak also of John Valdez, illustrious both by his descent and his piety, who, leaving us, in his published compositions, specimens of his erudition, writes, that *he knows nothing else of God and his Son, than that there is one Most High God, the Father of Christ; and our Lord Jesus Christ, his only Son, who was conceived of the Holy Spirit in the Virgin’s womb; and one Spirit of both?*’”

Bock insinuates, that no one could interpret the above words in an Antitrinitarian sense, who was not himself an Antitrinitarian. But it may be put to any candid Trinitarian, whether he would choose to adopt this declaration of Valdez, as a fair statement of his own opinions; and whether he could conscientiously say, that “he knows *nothing else* of God and his Son,” than what may be found in the above extract.

Valdez’s work, entitled, “Considerations on a Religious Life,” was originally written in Spanish, and afterwards translated into Latin, and several of the Continental languages. A manuscript copy of the Latin version, written in the year 1558, was deposited in the Offenbachian Library at Frankfort. The Italian version, from which the French, English, Dutch, German and Latin versions were probably made, bears the following title. “Le Cento e dieci divine Consideratione del Signore Giovanni Valdesso, nelle quali si Ragiona delle cose più utili, più necessarie, et più perfette della Christiana Professione. In Basilea, 1550,” 8vo. Coelius Secundus Curio wrote the Preface to it, in which he commends Peter Martyr for bringing it with him, as a great treasure, from Italy, and causing it to be printed at Basle. A French translation of it was published at Lyons, in 8vo., as early as the year 1563, by

C. K. [that is, Cl. de Kerquisinen]. This was reprinted at Paris in 1565, 16mo. The English translation was made by Nicholas Ferrar, and printed at Oxford, in 4to., A.D. 1638; and Dr. Jackson, by whom it was edited, describes it as containing “many learned discourses of experimental and practical divinity, well expressed, and elegantly illustrated; and yet,” he adds, “there be some few expressions and similitudes in it, at which not only the weak reader may stumble, and the envious quarrel; but also the wise and charitable reader may justly blame.” Dr. J. afterwards alludes to “suspicious places, and some manifest errors,” by which he probably means passages which savour of heterodoxy. Beza speaks of this work in very bitter terms, and represents it as the source whence Ochinus derived his heretical opinions. Bock says, on the other hand, that he has “perceived in these meditations no blasphemies against the word of God, of which they have sometimes been accused, although” he has “read them over again and again;” and he refers to some statements and expressions, which certainly are not wanting in orthodoxy. But it is highly improbable, either that the Ministers, alluded to by Sandius, should have deceived themselves, and misled him, by referring to certain expressions as those of Valdez, which he never penned; or that, in quoting them, to shew the bias of the writer’s mind towards Antitrinitarianism, these Ministers should altogether have misapprehended their purport. Walchius places Valdez among “Socinian Commentators,” along with such writers as John Crellius, and Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich; and what Bayle has said concerning him, in his Dictionary, has convinced some, that his proper place is among Antitrinitarians. For these reasons, therefore, the present account of him is inserted in the body of this work; and till arguments more cogent, and more to the purpose, are adduced in favour of the con-

trary opinion, he must continue to be regarded as an Anti-trinitarian.

The chronology of Valdez's life is involved in some obscurity. The earliest account of him is found in two letters, addressed to him by Erasmus, A.D. 1528 and 1529; in which he is represented as a young man, no less distinguished by a love of elegant literature, than by sincere Christian piety. From this time he lived chiefly in Italy. In 1535, he went to Naples; and, according to Antonio Caraccioli, did more to subvert men's minds, than an army of eight thousand German soldiers, who had been previously assembled there, and had carried with them the seeds of the Lutheran heresy. Being a man of literature and refinement, he soon drew around him a number of followers, among whom were Galleazzo Caraccioli, Peter Martyr, and Bernardine Ochinus.

De Porta says, that Valdez ventured to attack the prevalent false opinions respecting good works, and to expose several superstitions; but adds, that his followers did not go beyond the article of Justification, and therefore frequented Church, and continued to attend Mass.

It was not till 1541, that Ochinus's acquaintance with Valdez commenced; and Sandius informs us, that he flourished in 1542. Yet Bayle and others represent his death as having taken place as early as 1540; and it appears, from a letter addressed by Bonfadio to Carnesecchi, and published in "*Lettere Volgari di diversi Nobilissimi Huomini*," (Ald. 1543,) that he was then currently reported to be dead. "I wish we were again at Naples," says Bonfadio; "but when I consider the matter in another point of view, to what purpose should we go there now, when Valdez is dead? His death truly is a great loss to us, and to the world; for Valdez was one of the rarest men in Europe.—Life scarcely supported his infirm and spare

body : but his nobler part, and pure intellect, as if it had been placed without the body, was wholly occupied with the contemplation of truth and divine things. I condole with Marco Antonio (Flaminio), for above all others he greatly loved and admired him."

C. S. Curio, in the Preface to the "Divine Consideration," says, "Valdez did not much follow the Court after that Christ had revealed himself to him; but abode in Italy, spending the greatest part of his life at Naples, where, with the sweetness of his doctrine, and the sanctity of his life, he gained many disciples unto Christ; and especially among the gentlemen and cavaliers, and some ladies, he was very eminent and praiseworthy in all kinds of praise. It seemed that he was appointed by God for a Teacher and Pastor of noble and illustrious personages: and not this alone, but he gave light to some of the most famous Preachers of Italy, which I very well know, having conversed with them themselves." Valdez wrote

1. Two Dialogues in Italian,—one between Charon and Mercury, and the other between Lactantius and an Archdeacon. Sandius also mentions,

2. Pious and learned Considerations;

3. On some of the Psalms;

4. On the Gospel of Matthew;

5. On the Gospel of John;

6. A Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, A.D. 1556; and

7. A Commentary on the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. This Commentary was prohibited in the Spanish Expurgatory Indexes. Vergerius, in his "Animadversions on the First Index of Prohibited Books," attributes one or two other works to Valdez.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 2. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 980—982; T. II. pp. 315—320. *Catal. Universal. Bibl. Uffenbachianæ Libr.* tam

Typis quam Manu exarat. Francof. ad Mœn. 1729—1731, 8vo. T. III. N. 31, p. 578. *Bezæ* Opp. T. III. p. 200, Ep. 4. *Walchii* Bibl. Theol. T. IV. pp. 690. 695. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. VALDES (JEAN). *Erasmii* Opp. T. III. pp. 619. 824. *Melch. Adam*. Vitæ Theolog. Exter. Principum, p. 16, col. 2. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Rætic., Curie Rætorum, 1771—1774, 4to. L. ii. C. i. p. 9. *M'Crie's* Hist. of the Reformation in Italy, 1833, Ed. 2, Chap. iii. pp. 134, 135. Hist. of the Reformation in Spain, Chap. iv. pp. 140—146.

10.

CAMILLUS SICULUS, who took the name of RENATUS on his conversion to Protestantism, was a man of extraordinary acuteness, and of deep and extensive learning. It has been said, that he was one of the members of a celebrated society at Vicenza, of which a more particular account will be given under the article LÆLIUS SOCINUS (*Art. 13*); but Camillus had certainly left Italy before the year 1546, when that society was broken up. Switzerland served as a retreat to many, who fled from that priest-ridden country, on account of their religion, about this time; and among these were not a few who were inclined to the opinions of Servetus. Some of them were men of first-rate talents and attainments, as well as exemplary in all the relations of social and domestic life. Such were Camillus Siculus, Bernardine Ochinus, Cœlius Secundus Curio, Lælius Socinus, Matthew Gribaldus, John Paul Alciati, Valentine Gentilis, George Blandrata, and Peter Paul Vergerius. They did not all tread in exactly the same path: but all departed more or less from the common faith, even as received among Protestants. They were known by the name of *Anabaptists*, because they agreed with that sect on the subject of Baptism; but their opinions were entitled to much more weight, and were the result of more deliberate and profound thought, than those of the German and Dutch Anabaptists. They objected to the doctrine of the Trinity, and said that the usual mode of explaining that doctrine

was such, as to render it inconsistent, absurd and contradictory ; and on many other subjects, their opinions differed widely from the recognized orthodox standard of the time.

A body of these men having been obliged to quit their country between the years 1540 and 1543, and having settled in the Valteline, in the hope of being useful among a people, who were entirely destitute of the means of religious knowledge, Camillus joined them, and took up his residence at Caspan, where the sons of several of the gentry were placed under his charge. He came into the Valteline about the year 1542, and Curio arrived there nearly at the same time. They accidentally met, and contracted a friendship, which, in spite of their diversities of opinion on some subjects, did not terminate but with their lives. Curio went to Basle, where he had no difficulty in obtaining employment as a Teacher ; but Camillus remained for some time at Caspan, and procured a subsistence, by instructing the children of Raphael Paravacino, and some other wealthy neighbours.

About the year 1547, he was induced, by the prospect of improving his worldly circumstances, to remove to Chiavenna, where he continued to follow the profession of a Tutor, with diligence and success. But he was cautious in disseminating his opinions, and ventured to communicate them only to a few particular friends. Nor did he impart them even to these friends in a free and unreserved manner, but cautiously and clandestinely ; insinuating them in the shape of doubts, rather than laying them down in the form of direct propositions. He was a frequent correspondent of Bullinger's, but never appeared, in his letters, to dissent from the doctrines taught in the church at Zurich, although secretly opposed to some of them.

His zeal for the spread of his own sentiments had not been so great at Caspan, as it afterwards became at Chia-

venna. Yet the family of Paravacino, and probably some others, embraced them, during his residence at the former place. At Chiavenna he found a much wider field for his exertions; but his efforts did not escape the vigilance of Mainardi, the Protestant Minister of that town, who, as soon as he obtained an intimation of what was going on, watched the movements of Camillus, and endeavoured to counteract his designs. He remonstrated with Camillus in private; but finding his representations ineffectual, he put his hearers upon their guard, and drew up a Confession of Christian Doctrine, consisting of twenty heads, in the tenth of which he enumerated, and condemned, all the peculiar opinions of Camillus, but without mentioning him by name. This Confession he submitted to the members of his Church, for their consideration. But when he urged subscription to it, he found, that he had only been throwing an apple of discord among them; for none, who either openly or secretly approved of the opinions of Camillus, could be induced, by any consideration, to affix their names to it. The original of this Confession is no longer in existence; but Peter Leonis, a follower of Camillus, inserted the Articles, condemnatory of his master's opinions, in an apologetical treatise, which he published at Milan, in 1561.

These Articles are twenty-two in number, and are given at length by De Porta. Many of the opinions condemned in them were afterwards held by Faustus Socinus and his followers, particularly those relating to the natural immortality of the soul, and its sleep, after the death of the body, till the last day; the new and spiritual body with which the pious will hereafter return to life (Art. i.—iii.); the annihilation of the wicked (Art. xii.); the sacraments (Art. vii. ix. xiii. xv. xviii.—xxii.); the merits of Christ (Art. x.); and justification by faith (Art. xvi.). The Socinians also taught, that all religion must have its origin in revela-

tion, and that human reason, when left to itself, is incapable of arriving at a knowledge of God, or the Divine Will;—a sentiment, which Camillus had before expressed, when he said (*Art.* iv. cf. xvii.), “there is no natural law to man, by which he is able to distinguish between right and wrong.” But his opinion concerning the obligation of the Decalogue upon Christians slightly differed from that of the followers of F. Socinus. He taught that the Decalogue was not binding upon Christian believers, because they were not under the law; and that the pious have no need of any other law than that of the Spirit (*Art.* v.). The Socinians, on the contrary, though they allowed that the ceremonial law was abolished by Christ, nevertheless contended, that the Decalogue, as explained and enlarged by him, was binding; but only so far as he himself had confirmed it. Camillus further taught, that, by Adam’s sin, death entered into the world; but that Adam and his posterity would nevertheless have died, if he had not sinned (*Art.* vi.). The Socinians held precisely the same doctrine. They denied, too, with Camillus (*Art.* xiv.), that Baptism was substituted for Circumcision; or that the two rites had anything in common. On some points, however, the Socinians did not adopt the same views as Camillus. For instance; he held the doctrine of Original Sin, and taught that Christ was conceived in sin, and therefore inherited a sinful nature (*Art.* viii.). They, on the other hand, rejected the doctrine of Original Sin, and contended, that Jesus was conceived of the Holy Spirit, and free from all stain of sin. Nor did they approve of the sentiment of Camillus, that Christ despaired upon the cross, and gave up his trust in God, when he said, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (*Art.* xi.).

But notwithstanding these differences, it has been thought that Lælius Socinus, who was the steady and zealous friend

of Camillus throughout the whole of his disputes with Mainardi, was indebted to the former for the groundwork of that theological system, which he bequeathed to his nephew Faustus, and which was afterwards known by the name of *Socinianism*. Vergerius, writing to Bullinger, Oct. 11th, 1553, says, "It is the opinion of all, that the whole Anabaptism of Italy depends upon Camillus alone." Of all those who were called *Anabaptists*, indeed, Camillus was accounted the leader, and the patron, by his contemporaries. By the orthodox he was deemed the pest of all the Churches, and of all heretics the most heretical. Some of his disciples, who enjoyed a large share of his confidence, made no scruple of openly avowing themselves Antitrinitarians; and Bock tells us, that Camillus himself disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, and denied that there were three persons in the Divine Essence. Yet he was so wary in instilling his opinions, that it was a difficult matter to fix upon him a direct charge of heresy. When he was hardly pressed by Mainardi to say, whether he believed the soul to be immortal, he generally escaped by some such evasive answer as the following:—"Camillus does not know whether the soul is mortal or not." If he perceived that this reply was deemed unsatisfactory to those who were present, he would say, "I do not affirm that the soul of man *is* mortal: I only say so for argument's sake." When about to dispute, therefore, with Mainardi, he did not bring into prominent view the main questions at issue between them, respecting the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the merits of Christ, but wished the whole controversy to hinge upon the doctrine concerning the Sacraments; and it was on the questions relating to the nature and efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that he and his followers ultimately with-

drew from the ministry of Mainardi, and formed themselves into a separate religious community.

“Camillo,” says M’Crie, “complained loudly of the conduct of Mainardi. He held up his opponent as at once ignorant and intolerant. In this he was encouraged by Stancari and Negri. The consequence was, that Mainardi incurred the censures of some of his countrymen, who occasionally visited the place, such as Vergiero and Altieri; and received letters from the Grisons and Switzerland, admonishing him to conduct himself with greater moderation. From the time that Camillo came to the Valteline, he had kept up a correspondence with Bullinger by letters, in which he endeavoured to ingratiate himself with him, by professing his agreement with the Church at Zurich; but when his opponent offered to submit the controversy between them to the judgment of that venerable Divine, he declined the proposal. The Grison Synod, which met in 1547, called the parties before them, but Camillo neither attended, nor sent a letter of excuse, upon which they enjoined him to desist from opposing his Minister, and disturbing the peace of the Church. As he disregarded this injunction, a deputation consisting of four of the principal Ministers of the Grisons, was sent to Chiavenna in the close of the year 1549, to inquire into the affair. The deputation found all the charges brought against Camillo proved, and declared that Mainardi had acted the part of a faithful and vigilant Minister; but with a view of restoring harmony they drew up certain Articles to which they required both parties to agree. Although Camillo subscribed this agreement, the deputies had scarcely left the place when he resumed his former practices, in consequence of which the Consistory of Chiavenna suspended him from Church privileges, and, on his proving contumacious, publicly pro-

nounced the sentence of excommunication against him.—After this we hear little of Camillo. That he was alive, and in Chiavenna or the neighbourhood of it, in 1555, appears from a letter of Julio da Milano to Bullinger, in which he speaks of him as requiring still to be narrowly watched.”

In Simler's Collection, Vol. 83, there is, a spirited Latin poem, consisting of 357 hexameter verses, composed by Camillus, and containing an indignant remonstrance, addressed “To John Calvin, on the unjust burning of Servetus.” This poem is dated Sept. 1554.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 581, 582, et *passim*. *Trechsel*, Mich. Servet und seine Vorgänger, Beilage IV. S. 321—328. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Rætic. T. I. L. ii. C. iv. *Illgen*, Symbolæ ad Vitam et Doctrin. Læi. Socini illustrandam, Partic. i. pp. 62—64. *M'Crie's* Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Ch. vi. pp. 408—412, and *passim*.

11

CÆLIUS SECUNDUS CURIO, (*Italicè*, CURIONE,) was born at San Chirico, in Piedmont, May 1st, 1503; and was the youngest son in a family of twenty-three children. He lost both his parents, before he had completed his ninth year. His father, who was allied to some of the first families in Piedmont, held a distinguished civic office at Moncaglieri, and superintended his son's education, till the period of his own death. Cœlius was the favourite child of both his parents; and his father, who always regarded him as the hope and stay of the family, besides leaving him an equal share in his personal property with the rest of his children, bequeathed to him the family mansion at Moncaglieri, together with an estate in the country, and a beautifully embellished Bible.

After the death of his parents he was sent to a public school, where he made a rapid proficiency in classical knowledge; but the course of education pursued in this seminary

being too narrow to satisfy his aspiring mind, he removed to the University of Turin, and devoted himself to the study of Oratory, Poetry, History and Jurisprudence, under the Professors who then had charge of those departments.

He had scarcely completed his twentieth year, when the names of Luther and Zwingle began to be the general topics of conversation: and deeming it unjust to join in the prevailing outcry against them, without allowing them an opportunity of defending themselves, he resolved to procure their writings, and make himself thorough master of the controversy. By the assistance of some friends he obtained a sight of Luther's treatises on Indulgences, and on the Babylonish Captivity, Zwingle's Essay on true and false Religion, and some of the writings of Melancthon and Erasmus; and his curiosity was so much excited by the perusal of these, that he felt an ardent desire to become acquainted with their authors. With this view he invited James Cornelli and Francis Guarini, two of his fellow-students, who afterwards became eminent Protestant Ministers, to be his companions on a tour into Germany;—an invitation, which neither of them was slow to accept.

Before they had proceeded many miles on their way, these sanguine youths, with buoyant spirits and light hearts, to beguile the tedium of their journey, entered into a friendly religious discussion; but being reported to Boniface, Cardinal Bishop of Ivrea, by some of the country people, as men of suspicious character, he caused them to be apprehended, and lodged in prison. Curio was now separated from his companions, and conducted to the castle of Capriano: but after a confinement of about two months, he was liberated at the request of some influential friends, and discharged with a gentle admonition.

The Bishop, who saw that he was a young man of considerable promise, took him under his own protection, and

sent him to prosecute his studies at the monastery of San Benigno. But here his contempt for the Catholic superstitions soon began to display itself, and was carried to a length, which, but for the good fortune that ever accompanied him, might, even in more enlightened times, have been attended with very serious consequences. Having clandestinely obtained access to the shrine, where certain relics were deposited, he abstracted them from their hiding-place, and left in their stead a copy of the Bible, which he had taken from the library of the monastery, and in a blank leaf of which he wrote these words:—"This is the ark of the covenant, from which the genuine oracles of God may be learned, and in which are contained the true relics of the saints." All this was done with so much tact and cleverness, that for a long time no suspicion was entertained of what had taken place. The relics which Curio had removed were only allowed to see the light on particular occasions, and on the eve of one of these, apprehending that the suspicion of having purloined them would fall upon himself, he absconded, and travelled on foot, by way of Milan and Rome, into the Neapolitan territory.

After visiting most of the principal cities in Italy, he returned to Milan, where he resided for some years. As he was endowed by nature with talents of the highest order, which he had improved by assiduous cultivation, he was at no loss for the means of obtaining a comfortable livelihood, which he did by devoting himself to the office of an instructor of youth. During his residence at Milan, he was noticed by some of the principal families of the place; and conducted himself so as to secure the esteem and good-will of all parties. At that time the Milanese was occupied by Spanish troops, and the country was ravaged by famine and pestilence, and all the horrors which usually follow in the train of war. Curio was unwearied in his attention to

the sufferers. He not only distributed to the poor what he obtained from the liberality of many persons of distinction, but, coöperating with the noble family of the Isacci in the suburbs, to which he had retired, he induced the clergy, when all other resources failed, to apply the Church revenues to the relief of the poor; and when all besides fled, and left their friends and relations to provide for themselves, he remained at his post, and not only administered consolation to those who stood in need of it, but, with the aid of a single companion, buried those who had fallen victims to famine or disease.

By his noble and disinterested conduct on this occasion, Curio so far ingratiated himself into the favour of Margherita Bianca Isacca, an elegant and accomplished young lady of illustrious family, as to obtain her hand in marriage. Wishing now to settle in some quiet part of Italy, where he and his bride would be free from the hostile incursions of the Spanish troops, he removed to Casale, in the neighbouring Duchy of Monferrat. This was in 1530; but after the lapse of a few years, his brothers being then all dead, he was urged by friends to return to his native place, where a married sister, the only surviving member of the family beside himself, had possessed herself of his patrimony. On his arrival, he met with a hospitable reception from his sister and her husband, who thought that he had come merely for the purpose of visiting his friends. But when they found, that his object was to recover what they had dishonestly appropriated to their own use, his sister, pretending that his life was in danger, on account of his heretical opinions, urged him to seek safety, by flight to a neighbouring town, then in the occupation of Claude of Savoy. Curio thought that he might there settle his affairs without danger; and, in process of time, when the rumours against him had died away, might return, and take posses-

sion of his property. Meanwhile, however, that he might not remain unemployed, he undertook the education of some youths of noble family, and by his learning and acquirements, combined with a happy mode of imparting instruction, obtained the patronage and friendship of most of the neighbouring nobility.

At this period of his life, he chanced to be one day on a visit with some friends in a certain place, where a Dominican Friar, of Turin, was zealously declaiming against Luther; and telling his hearers that this great light of the Reformation not only permitted his followers to indulge in every species of licentious gratification, but even went so far as to deny the Divinity of Christ, and his birth of the Virgin Mary. At the close of the discourse, Curio requested the Preacher to point out any passage in Luther's writings, from which these grave charges could be substantiated; to which the Friar replied, that he would not then discuss the matter with him, but that if Curio would accompany him to Turin, he would convict Luther of having advanced far more dangerous opinions than these. Upon this, Curio took out of his pocket Luther's "Commentary on the Galatians," and proved the utter falsity of the Friar's charge, by quoting the Reformer's own words. This exposure completely discomfited the Preacher; and the people would have wreaked their vengeance upon him in a summary way, had he not made a precipitate retreat to Turin. Safely arrived in that city, he applied to the Chief Inquisitor to arrest Curio, whose lot it was again to suffer imprisonment on a charge of heresy. The old story of the relics was now revived; and he was reminded of the heretical conversation, which had brought him under the displeasure of the Bishop of Ivrea. All things, in short, seemed to conspire against him; and his friends were upon the point of giving him up as lost. At this critical conjuncture he dexterously eluded

the vigilance of his keepers; and effected his escape in the following curious manner.

The Bishop of Turin had undertaken a journey to Rome, for the purpose of obtaining the Pope's sanction to the proceedings against him. In the mean time, Curio was consigned to the custody of the Bishop's colleague, David, brother of Cardinal Cibo, who, for greater security, had caused him to be placed in fetters, and removed by night to a private apartment, enclosed within strong walls, and guarded by two sentinels. It so happened that Curio, when a boy, had been confined in this very room, so that he had a perfect recollection of every part of the premises; and as his feet were much swollen by the tightness of the shackles which were fastened upon them, (the debilitating effects of which he continued to feel through the remainder of his life,) he requested that one foot might be set at liberty, and when the swelling was removed, that this might be bound, and the other liberated. This request being granted, it occurred to him, after he had been in confinement for some days, to try whether he could not make a false leg, and get it fettered instead of the true one. With this view he took off the stocking of the leg which was at liberty, and stuffed it full of linen rags; and when he had succeeded in completing his ingenious contrivance, he begged that he might be allowed to have the convalescent foot bound, and the other set at liberty. His request was granted: the true foot was liberated; the pretended one was fettered; and he was now comparatively a free man again.

One stormy night, while the sentinels were asleep, he opened the door of his place of confinement, slipped down stairs unperceived by them, and finding the outer door securely bolted and barred, made his escape through the window. In the morning, when the guards saw that their

prisoner was gone, and that the fetters by which he had been bound were still locked, and had not been forced asunder by violence, they came to the conclusion that he had effected his escape by the aid of magical arts; and when this rumour concerning him got abroad, that the Christian name might not lie under so odious an imputation, he published a humorous dialogue, under the title of "Probus," in which he gave a detailed account of the whole matter, and expressed his gratitude to God for so remarkable a deliverance.

He had now become so obnoxious to the Catholic clergy, that his only means of safety lay in flight; and taking with him his wife and children, he made the best of his way to Sale, a town of Milan, which lay at some distance from the high road. Here he was soon recognized by some gentlemen, who usually spent their summer months at their country houses near this place, and by whom he was prevailed upon, almost against his will, to accept of a Professorship in the University of Pavia; and although the Inquisitors had strict orders to seize him, he was enabled for a long time to set them at defiance by the vigilance of his pupils, who escorted him daily backwards and forwards, between the University and the place of his residence, for the space of three whole years. At length the Pope threatening to excommunicate the whole senate of Pavia, if Curio was not delivered up, he was allowed to make his escape, and took refuge in the Venetian territory. The vengeance of his enemies still pursuing him, he sought the protection of Renata, Duchess of Ferrara, by whose interest he obtained a Professor's chair in the University of Lucca: but before the expiration of a twelvemonth, a papal order for his apprehension, and removal to Rome, was received by the Senate, and he once more found it expedient to consult his safety by flight.

Curio now saw, that he could remain no longer in Italy, without being daily in imminent hazard of his life; and came to the determination of seeking that asylum in a foreign country, which was denied to him in his native land. Having therefore procured letters of recommendation from the Duchess of Ferrara, he went to Switzerland, and was appointed Rector of the College of Lausanne, an office which he discharged with great credit and acceptance for about four years.

Soon after his settlement at Lausanne, he returned into Italy in quest of his family, and narrowly escaped being taken by the Pope's emissaries at Pisa. While seated at dinner, the Bargello, or Prefect of the Inquisition, unexpectedly made his appearance; and having previously secured the approach to the house by a strong guard, he entered the room in which Curio was regaling himself, and arrested him in the name of the Chief Pontiff. Curio rose from the table, and was in the act of surrendering himself; but happening still to have in his hand the knife which he had been using at dinner, and being a robust and powerful man, the Prefect was in his turn alarmed, and fainted. Curio, with remarkable presence of mind, now seized his opportunity. He left the room, went down stairs, passed, without being recognized, through the midst of the guard which was stationed at the door, entered the stable, mounted his horse, and rode off. On the recovery of the Bargello from his fainting fit, the alarm was given, and the hue and cry raised. But Curio was now beyond the reach of his pursuers. A violent storm soon compelled them to take shelter, and the delay thus occasioned, while it favoured his flight, rendered further pursuit on their part hopeless.

Having thus once more escaped the jaws of death, he returned to Lausanne, where he was shortly joined by his wife and children; and finally removed to Basle, A.D.

1547, during the Rectorship of Sebastian Munster. His original intention was not to have settled in that city; but some of the most eminent Professors of the University, among whom was Martin Borrhaüs, and the celebrated printers, Jerome Froben and Nicholas Episcopius, together with others who knew the extent of his erudition, requested him to take up his abode among them. With this request he was induced to comply; and he had not been long resident in Basle, before he was appointed Professor of Eloquence and Belles-lettres in the University, an office for which he was eminently qualified, and which he discharged, with uninterrupted satisfaction, till the end of his life.

The Pope now solicited him to return into Italy, and made him a very liberal offer, together with the promise of a free pardon, on the sole condition of his abstaining, in future, from the discussion of religious subjects. The Duke of Savoy, on hearing of this, made him a still more flattering proposal. The Emperor Maximilian was likewise anxious to secure his literary services in the University of Vienna; and the Waiwode of Transylvania offered him a valuable appointment in the newly-established College of Weissenberg. But he declined all these inviting proposals, and continued, for the space of three and twenty years, to devote himself, with unwearied assiduity, to the discharge of his official duties in the University of Basle, preferring the society of such men as that seat of learning afforded, to all the splendid allurements held out to him by foreign courts. He died at Basle on Tuesday, November 22nd, A.D. 1569, in the sixty-seventh year of his age.

A few months before he was attacked by the complaint which carried him to the grave, he had his likeness taken; and when he was asked the reason by a friend, his reply was, that the period of his dissolution was not far distant, and he was anxious that his family, when they saw that

representation of him, should remember him, and call to mind the pious precepts, which he had inculcated upon them during his life. From that time, he ceased not to meditate upon his approaching end; and when it arrived, he met it with the calmness and composure of a Christian.

Curio left behind him, in his works, many splendid monuments of genius and erudition. His Introductory Address, prefixed to Valdez's "Considerations on a Religious Life," has been already mentioned. (*Vide Art.* 9.) Besides editing that work, he translated into Latin Guicciardini's "History of the Wars of Italy," and some of Ochinus's "Sermons;" and published a collection of "Pasquinades" in French and Italian, which were remarkable for the pungency of their wit. Among his original writings, an imperfect list of which is given by Stupanus, in his "Panegyric Oration on the Life and Death of C. S. Curio," were many on the subjects of Education, Philosophy, Grammar, Logic, History, Antiquities, and other topics connected with General Literature. His Theological and Metaphysical Works comprise

1. An Essay on the Providence of God;
2. An Essay on the Immortality of the Soul;
3. A Paraphrase on the Proëm of John's Gospel;
4. Dialogues on the Extent of God's Kingdom; and
5. Christian Institutes.

It has been customary to represent the subject of this memoir simply in the light of an Italian Reformer; but judging from a variety of well known, and incontestable facts, there appears to be ample ground for the conclusion, that he was, what numbers beside have been, who have lived and died with a fair reputation for orthodoxy, a Crypto-Unitarian. Sandius, it is true, has not inserted an account of him in his "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum.*" But Sandius, it should be recollected, died before he had

completed that work, and left it in so unfinished a state, that Benedict Wissowatius, on whom the labour of editorship devolved, inserted nearly seventy additional biographical notices; and, after all, by no means held it up to view as a finished production. In his prefatory remarks, he requests the reader to correct any errors which may have crept into the work; and particularly desires, that, if he should detect any omissions, or acquire any additional information, he will not scruple to imitate the example of Sandius and himself, in communicating the result of his inquiries to the literary world. The indefatigable Fred. Sam. Bock, acting upon this principle, has made considerable additions to the list of Antitrinitarians contained in the "Bibliotheca" of Sandius. Yet, fully conscious of the almost insuperable difficulties attendant upon his Herculean undertaking, he sent his elaborate history into the world, not as a perfect work, but only as an improvement upon what Sandius and others had done before him; and there can be little doubt, that future inquiries will enable us still further to extend the catalogue. Unless, therefore, more substantial reasons than the above can be assigned, for excluding Curio from among the number of Antitrinitarians, there is little probability of his name being ultimately lost to the Unitarian cause, particularly as many Trinitarian writers have not been backward in laying his character under a suspicion of heresy. This has been done by Lampe, in his *Ecclesiastical History*; by Peter Jænichi, in his *Animadversions upon a Catechism published by Samuel Crellius*; by Michael De la Roche, in his *Memoirs of the Literature of Great Britain*; and by Allwoerden, in his *History of Servetus*.

We learn from the last of these writers, that a copy of the "*Christianismi Restitutio*," in its original shape, written out by Servetus himself, once belonged to our Curio;

and that it afterwards passed into the hands of M. Du Fay, at the sale of whose library, in the year 1725, it was purchased by the Count De Hoym, the Polish Ambassador at the French Court. This celebrated manuscript appears, from the account given of it by Allwoerden, to have had the name of Cœlius *Horatius* Curio written in the title-page. It differed in many respects from the edition published by Servetus in 1553; and Allwoerden adopts M. Du Fay's conjecture, that it was the embryo of Servetus's larger work, and written out by himself. The same writer intimates, that Cœlius *Secundus* Curio, the father of *Horatius*, was once the possessor of this book; and pledges himself, on some future occasion, to prove that the elder Curio was a friend and follower of Servetus. This pledge was given in the year 1728; and that it was not given without due consideration, all will be disposed to admit, who have read the elaborate treatise on the life of Servetus. Schelhorn, however, writing only two years later, attempted to prove that Curio lived and died a firm believer in the Trinitarian faith; and by Bock and others his arguments have been deemed unanswerable. But the religious views of Curio have been represented to the world through a false medium by Schelhorn; and many important circumstances have been overlooked by him, which tend to shew, that the suspicions thrown out by Lampe, Jænichi, De la Roche and Allwoerden, are worthy of more attention, than it has hitherto been their lot to receive.

Schelhorn mainly rests his defence of Curio's orthodoxy respecting the Trinity upon three passages, taken from his "Opuseula," an octavo volume published at Basle, A.D. 1544. These Opuseula are small detached pieces, or tracts, written upon different subjects, and at different periods of the author's life; and exhibiting those shades of opinion, which it is natural to expect in the intellectual history of

a man like Curio. Most of them appear to have been composed before the views of their author became confirmed, and therefore assume a character more or less orthodox; but a Paraphrase on the Proëm of John's Gospel, which occupies the last place in the volume, and may therefore be regarded as containing the author's mature thoughts, is of a heterodox complexion, and has been adduced for the purpose of proving, that Curio had ceased to be a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity, at the period of its composition.

The first piece, to which our attention will be directed, is an Essay "on the Providence of God," called by its author "Araneus." In Schelhorn's first extract, which is taken from this Essay, (p. 81,) Curio speaks of "Jesus Christ as the Eternal Wisdom of the Father; as redeeming us from the curse of the law; and as becoming a victim, as well as sin and a curse for us." In his second extract, which is taken from a letter "On the pious Education of Children," (p. 132,) addressed to Fulvio Pelligrino Morato, Curio rises in his orthodoxy, and says, that "God made all things by his Word, whom the sacred oracles designate by the terms Jesus Christ, and Son of God; and that he sent his Son, Jesus Christ, who was at once true God and true man, begotten of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary." Judging from these passages, without reference to the probably early date of their composition, or without taking into account the circumstances attendant upon the publication of the volume of which they form a part, we should find it difficult to arrive at any other conclusion, than the one, to which it is the object of Schelhorn to lead us; namely, that the volume in which they occur was the production of a Trinitarian. But knowing, as we do, that, at the end of the collection of pieces from which the preceding extracts are taken, was printed, for the first time, a

Paraphrase on the Proëm of John's Gospel, expressed in such terms as to lead one orthodox writer, (Jænichi,) to infer, that its author was "entangled in the errors of Servetus;" and another, (Gerdesius,) to absolve him from the charge of heresy, solely on the ground of his not being "a theologian by profession:" knowing further, that, according to Schellhorn's own admission, Curio has, in this instance, transgressed the legitimate bounds of orthodoxy: our curiosity is excited to learn, what motive could have actuated him in the composition of this Paraphrase, and its publication in a volume of tracts, containing sentiments and expressions of a decidedly orthodox character.

The passages already quoted from the "Opuscula," it must be acknowledged, are far from being of a nature to excite suspicion; and Schellhorn has therefore adduced them as proofs of their author's soundness in the faith, in spite of his own admission, as to the heretical tendency of some expressions, introduced by Curio into his Paraphrase on the Proëm of John's Gospel. The same line of argument has been adopted by Gerdesius, who says, "Although we will not deny, that in his brief Paraphrase upon the beginning of the Gospel of John, he has laid down some things incautiously, which might bring upon him the suspicion of heresy, yet his remaining writings teach and evince, on the contrary, that he acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the true Son of God, and *true God*." But what are the "remaining writings" to which allusion is here made? Evidently those, which were composed before the above Paraphrase, and which have therefore nothing to do with the subject of our present investigation.

That Curio was a Trinitarian, when he first embraced the principles of the Reformation, is highly probable; but that he continued a Trinitarian to the end of his life, there is no evidence to prove. Schellhorn, however, would fain

persuade us, in spite of his own admission respecting the latitude of Curio's interpretations, that expressions at variance with the sentiments of Servetus and the early Unitarians, are to be found in an exhortation subjoined to the Paraphrase so often mentioned; and, in proof of this, he has adduced the following passage, which forms the third and last extract from the "Opuscula" of Curio. "What can be more delightful, or more becoming the character of a Christian man, than a mind which entertains correct views concerning God and Christ, and is instructed in all kinds of heavenly wisdom? Jews, philosophers and Mahometans can speak of God at once ingeniously, eloquently and profoundly, without mentioning the name of Christ, the Son of God, or having any fixed belief in him. But inasmuch as they do not acknowledge Christ, they build without a foundation: for Christ is the true, sole and permanent image, likeness and representation of God. Let them say or think as they please, therefore, their reasoning is all to no purpose. *We receive and worship one God in Christ, and one Lord Jesus Christ in God.*"

Now this passage, though not perhaps such as a modern Unitarian, of the school of Priestley or Lindsey, would have penned, contains nothing at variance with the sentiments of Socinus and his followers; for while Socinianism agrees with Judaism, Theism and Mahometanism, in maintaining the sole and undivided Unity of God, it inculcates a belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; recognizes him as the appointed Mediator between God and men; holds him up to view as the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his perfections; represents the most intimate union as subsisting between him and his heavenly Father; and teaches us, that, as Christians, it is incumbent upon us to "receive and worship one God in Christ, and

one Lord Jesus Christ in God.” These were the sentiments held by the majority of Antitrinitarians at the period of the Reformation, and taught in the Catechisms and Confessions of Faith published by their successors, of which the following extract from the Racovian Catechism affords sufficient evidence.

Q. “What has the Lord Jesus added to the first commandment?”

A. “That we are required to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ himself as one who has divine authority over us, and in that sense as God; that we are bound, moreover, to put our trust in him, and pay him divine honour.”

Q. “Is not the first commandment of the Decalogue altogether changed by this addition; that we are bound to acknowledge Jesus Christ as God, in the stated sense, and to approach him with divine worship?”

A. “That commandment is in no respect changed; for it only requires that we have no other Gods before God. But Christ is not another God, since God has communicated to him of his divine and celestial majesty, and has so far made him *one and the same with himself*.—The command therefore to *have* and *worship* but one God only, remains in force; the mode alone of worshiping him is changed, in so far as that *the only God was formerly worshiped WITHOUT Christ, but is now worshiped THROUGH Christ*.” (The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, translated from the Latin, by Dr. Thomas Rees, Sect. v. Chap. i. pp. 189. 194.)

This is but an echo of the sentiment, quoted with an air of triumph, by Schellhorn, from Curio, as an evidence of the belief of the latter in the Trinitarian faith; and yet the authors and editors of the Racovian Catechism, and the members of the Churches for whose instruction that Cate-

chism was originally drawn up, are to this day reckoned among the warmest, and ablest advocates of the Unitarian doctrine.

From a letter of Curio, inserted in the Works of Olympia Fulvia Morata, and, though without date, probably written after the publication of his Paraphrase, it appears that he had fallen under a suspicion of heresy; and when urged by the friend, to whom that letter was addressed, to publish a reply to the charge brought against him, he says that he deems it "a sufficient reply, if his life corresponds with his profession," and alludes to his published writings as vindicating him from the charge of heresy, and proving that he "*worships one God in one Jesus Christ.*" Here he obviously refers to the language employed by him in the passage from which Schelhorn's third extract is taken; and that language, as we have seen above, is in perfect accordance with the principles advocated by the Polish Socinians. But if Curio still retained the sentiments expressed in his letter to Olympia's father, why did he not repeat the stronger terms which he had there used? Let those who claim him as an orthodox believer consider this; and say whether they, as Trinitarians, would have contented themselves with stating, as Curio does, that they were worshipers of "one God in one Jesus Christ," if their faith had laboured under a similar imputation.

The circumstance of Curio's publishing the Paraphrase, which seems first to have brought him under the suspicion of heresy, in the same volume with other writings of a more orthodox cast, is one which will excite little surprise, when we recollect the character of the age in which he lived. Incredible are the artifices, to which men of liberal principles were at that time compelled to have recourse, for the purpose of disseminating their opinions. Sometimes an obnoxious author's name was concealed under an

anagram, or an acrostic : sometimes a work was published, professing to be on the orthodox side of a question, but intentionally sustained by weak and trifling arguments, with a view to excite doubts : sometimes the language of truth insinuated itself into the mind under the form of a dialogue, when it could make its way through no other channel ; and sometimes an heretical sentiment was promulgated under the cover of a work, which was otherwise of a character not to excite suspicion. These were the methods, by which the abuses in the Church of Rome were attacked, before the time of Luther ; by which the remaining errors of the Reformed Churches were covertly undermined, before the friends of rational Christianity found an asylum in Poland and Transylvania ; and of which, indefensible as they are in themselves, persecution affords some palliation. It was thus that Curio acted, when, in accordance with the spirit of the times, regarding his own safety, he published his volume of “*Opuscula*,” and made it the instrument, by which the seeds of Unitarianism were first disseminated among the rocks and valleys of Switzerland. In this volume the Paraphrase on the beginning of John’s Gospel occupies the last place ; and it was, no doubt, intended as an expression of the mature and deliberate opinion of its author, on an important subject, to which he had only slightly and incidentally adverted in the former pieces. It was sent into the world at a time, when Unitarianism had not dared to shew itself under any shape, among the Reformed Churches of Switzerland ; and although Curio survived its publication a full quarter of a century, no circumstance appears to have occurred, during the whole of that time, to weaken the doubts which had arisen as to his soundness in the faith, but many to strengthen and confirm them.

The first of these, which it falls in our way to mention,

is the confidential nature of Curio's intimacy with Lælius Socinus.—Lælius left Italy on the dispersion of the celebrated society at Vicenza, A. D. 1546; and after wandering over a great part of Switzerland, arrived safely at Basle in the year following, where he was kindly received, and hospitably entertained by Curio. This fact, which might in itself be deemed unimportant, is far otherwise, as connected with the subject of our present inquiry. Curio thought highly of the mental and moral qualities of Lælius; nor was the connexion which subsisted between them a mere casual intimacy, but a friendship founded upon mutual esteem. At the time that Lælius became Curio's guest, his religious opinions were perfectly formed, and never afterwards underwent any change of the slightest importance. He is said to have taken the lead among the followers of Servetus in Italy, and to have disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity before he had any thoughts of quitting that country. But he had the prudence to conceal his heretical opinions; and was in the habit of proposing them in the shape of doubts, for the solution of those, with whom he happened to converse. Some have thought it not improbable, that B. Ochinus, with whom Lælius was also upon terms of strict intimacy, was indebted to him for the objections, which form the basis of his celebrated "Dialogues on the Trinity." But however this may be, Lælius seems to have been upon a more friendly footing with Curio, than any of the persons with whom he associated, after his flight out of Italy; and probably opened his mind more freely on religious subjects to him, than to any one else. Hence it has been thought, and not without reason, that, though the opinions of these friends might not coincide on all points, there must yet have been a great similarity in their views, and modes of thinking; and that Curio must at least have been acquainted with the heterodox notions of Lælius

on the subject of the Trinity. Of this circumstance Schelhorn professes to make light; observing, that Melancthon and Bullinger, whose names stood in such high repute among orthodox Protestants, have both spoken in honourable terms concerning Lælius. It should not be forgotten, however, that with these two great men, his intercourse was of a far less confidential nature than with Curio, and that, in despite of all his caution, both of them were led to express doubts as to the soundness of his orthodoxy: whereas Curio never breathed the most distant hint respecting the heretical tendency of the religious views of Lælius, but on all occasions spoke of him in terms of the greatest endearment and affection.

The next circumstance, to which we shall advert, appears still more conclusive, as to the fact of Curio's heterodoxy on the subject of the Trinity. In the year 1549, he published a work, entitled, "*Christianæ Religionis Institutio*;" and in such a work it might very reasonably be expected, that an orthodox believer would dilate upon the subject of the Trinity, and represent it as a necessary and fundamental article of the Christian Faith. But not a syllable of the kind occurs in this treatise. Its author, on the contrary, explains the articles of the Christian Religion, without saying one word about the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead; whence it has been inferred, by M. De la Roche and others, that he was not a believer in that doctrine: and indeed it would seem in the highest degree improbable, that a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity should have published a work, the express object of which was to unfold the principles of the Christian Faith, without allowing a single observation of a decidedly Trinitarian character to escape him. It is not thus that the principles of Christianity are taught by Trinitarians in the present day: it was not thus that they were set forth by learned divines and

theologians in the days of Curio: nor, it may be presumed, would Curio have laid himself open to the charge of so palpable an omission, had he entertained a conscientious persuasion, that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught in the books of Scripture.

But silence is not the only offence, which has been laid to the charge of Curio. M. Dav. Clement, a French writer, has accused him of having purposely had recourse to tortuous modes of expression, with a view to conceal his heterodoxy; and even of having so artfully disguised his language, as to give it an apparently orthodox sense. The author of the present work has not the means of verifying this accusation by a collation of the writings of Curio, which are exceedingly scarce; but it may easily be imagined, that, surrounded as he was by such men as Calvin and Beza, he would express himself in precisely the terms attributed to him. He had a general character for liberality, and was, on that account, an object of great suspicion to Calvin, who would not have hesitated to immolate him upon the altar of persecution, had he been as unguarded in his expressions, and as confiding in his conduct, as the ill-fated Servetus. But the long series of indignities and sufferings, to which he had been exposed during his residence in Italy, had taught him a lesson of prudence, and put him upon his guard against the wily reformer.

The author of the celebrated “Dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus,” includes Curio in a long list of authors, quoted by Minus Celsus, in his treatise “De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi;” and adds, “qui omnes contra Calvinum pugnant, quos omnes nunc Calvinus uno in fasce colligatos conjecit una secum in cineres Serveti.” (Calv. 22.) The above Dialogue was originally published A. D. 1544, with the following title: “Contra Libellum Calvini, in quo ostendere conatur, Hæreticos jure gladii coercendos

esse.—*Nolite ante tempus quicquam judicare, donec veniat Dominus, qui illustraturus est occulta tenebrarum, et patefaciet consilia cordium.* 1 Cor. iv. 5.” A second edition of this Dialogue was published by the Arminians, A. D. 1612, with an Appendix, containing some remarks on the history of Servetus, and two vindictory epistles by Castalio, one of which is addressed to our Edward VI., and the other to the Council and Senate of Basle. Two copies of this edition are in the possession of the present writer. To one of these the original title-page is prefixed. The other is called, “*Dissertatio quâ disputatur, quo jure, quove fructu Hæretici sunt coërcendi gladio vel igne;*” and instead of the original motto, from 1 Cor. iv. 5, the following is subjoined from Deut. xiii. “*Si frater tuus incitaverit te, dicens, Eamus et serviamus diis alienis, non parces ei oculus tuus ut occultes eum, quin potius occides eum, et manus tua prima sit ut illum interficiat.*” In the remarks on the history of Servetus, subjoined to this edition, Curio is mentioned as one of those, whom Calvin would not have scrupled to persecute unto death, if he had happened to possess the power, and to hold intercourse with whom was a mortal sin.

Of the prudent course which Curio found it necessary to steer, in the disclosure of his opinions, respecting controverted points of doctrine, some idea may be formed from the circumstances attendant upon the publication of his work, entitled, “*De Amplitudine Beati Regni Dei Dialogi sive Libri duo, 1554,*” 8vo. The main peculiarity in the religious system of Calvin is a belief that God has destined to eternal happiness a comparatively small number of his rational creatures, and consigned the larger portion of the human race to everlasting misery. Upon this doctrine a covert attack is made in these Dialogues, in which Curio and Augustine Mainardi are the speakers; the former pro-

posing questions, and the latter undertaking to answer them, and to prove that the number of the elect exceeds that of the reprobated, or damned. By thus representing himself under the character of an inquirer, and putting into the mouth of another person all that was likely to be deemed obnoxious, Curio hoped to avoid giving offence, and at the same time to excite attention to a subject, on which the Helvetic Church appeared to have pronounced a hasty, as well as an arbitrary decision. These Dialogues were written at least seven years before they were published; and the publication of them was delayed solely by prudential considerations. While Curio was residing at Lausanne, he placed them in the hands of Martin Cellarius, whom he consulted as to the expediency of their publication. He was aware that they would excite a sensation in the religious world; and wished to fortify himself with the opinion of that learned and excellent man. What the advice of Cellarius was is not known; but, judging from the delay which occurred in the publication of these Dialogues, it seems reasonable to infer, that he recommended a cautious mode of procedure. Curio afterwards submitted them to the inspection of the censors of the press, and Ministers of the Reformed Church at Basle, who pronounced them unfit to meet the public eye; and when, notwithstanding this formal decision, they surreptitiously made their appearance, it required all the sagacity of their ingenious author, combined with some degree of duplicity, to avert the consequences of so daring a violation of public authority. Curio, in his Apology, addressed to the Senate of Basle, says, that his son Horatius published them, in some town in the North of Italy; but the latter part of this assertion is directly contradicted by the testimony of John Oporinus, an eminent printer at Basle, who has included them in a Catalogue of Works, printed by himself. “The author,”

says Schellhorn, (*Amœn. Lit.* Tom. XII. p. 626,) “was afraid of bringing himself into trouble, by an open declaration of the truth, because he published this work without the consent and knowledge of the censors of Basle.” Bayle assures us, that the first edition of these Dialogues made its appearance at Basle, A. D. 1554, and if this be true, the other part of Curio’s assertion is rendered extremely dubious; for his son, Horatius, upon whom he charges the act of publication, died on the 15th of February in that very year. But the truth is, that Curio had a violent struggle to maintain, between his love of truth and a regard to his own safety; and if he was sometimes led to prevaricate with his conscience, and to conceal his real sentiments, we must attribute it to the temper of the times in which he lived, and to the dread of falling a victim to that persecuting spirit, which had recently consigned the unhappy Servetus to the flames.

But we come now to notice, in the last place, the part which Curio took in the publication of Ochinus’s Dialogues; and which, it may safely be affirmed, could not have been the act of a conscientious Trinitarian. A manuscript copy of these Dialogues, in the Italian language, was submitted, by Peter Perna, the printer, to the inspection of Basil Amersbach, Rector of the University of Basle, who, being unacquainted with the Italian, referred it to the judgment of Curio. When Curio had perused it, he returned it to the printer, and gave it as his opinion, that it contained nothing, which need operate as a bar to its publication. Upon this, the printer ventured to commit to the press, not the Italian copy, which Curio had examined, but a Latin version of it by Castalio; and thus made it accessible to the learned throughout Europe. But notwithstanding Curio’s favourable opinion of the contents of these Dialogues, they were found, on examination, to contain much

that was objectionable, on the subject of the Trinity ; which brought upon their author a summary sentence of banishment from the city and territory of Zurich, where he was residing at the time of their publication. Here, then, arises an interesting question for the casuists. The printer could say, that he did his duty in submitting the manuscript to the inspection of Basil Amersbach, the censor ; and that, if the work was fit for publication, it mattered little whether it was printed in Latin, or Italian : the censor might plead ignorance of the language in which the manuscript was written, and refer to the high character of Curio, in justification of the part, which he took in the transaction : while Curio would hold himself exonerated upon the plea, that he was answerable only for the contents of the original manuscript, which might have undergone a thousand changes in the process of translation. We find, accordingly, that the whole burden of the blame ultimately fell upon Castalio, the translator, who thus attempts to exculpate himself, and the printer who employed him : “ With regard to the charge of my having translated the Dialogues of B. Ochinus, that, I think, cannot in fairness be imputed to me as a fraud. For I rendered them into Latin, as I had before rendered other works of the same writer, not as a judge, but simply as a translator by profession, with a view to obtain something for the support of my family : and the printer informed me, that he had submitted the book to the censorship, and that it had been regularly approved, according to the laws of the city of Basle.” Who does not see, then, that, if responsibility attaches to any one, it must be to the person, who pronounced these Dialogues fit for publication ? Curio could not fail to know, that they contained a great deal of matter at variance with the creed of the Reformed Church, particularly on the subject of the Trinity ; and, knowing this,

how shall we free him from the suspicion of secretly favouring the sentiments of their author? The whole affair, it must be confessed, has very much the appearance of an ingenious plot, invented for the purpose of introducing these Dialogues into the world, without directly implicating any of the parties concerned.

VIDEND. *Stupani* Oratio Panegyrica de Cœlii Secundi Curionis Vita atque Obitu, habita Basileæ Anno 1570; apud *Schellhornii* Amœn. Lit. T. XIV. pp. 325—402. Hist. Dialogor. C. S. Curionis de Amplitud. beati Regni Dei; apud *Schellh.* Aæn. Lit. T. XII. pp. 592—627. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 308—313. 457. 498. 502. 584. 588. *Allwoerden*, Hist. Mich. Serveti, p. 194. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et. Crit. Art. CURION. *Aikin's* General Biography, Art. CURIO. *Trechsel*, Michael Servet und seine Vorgänger, S. 214—217. *M'Crie's* Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Ch. iii. pp. 129—133, etc.

12.

BERNARDINE OCHINUS, (*Ital.* OCCHINO, or OCHINO,) to whom we have already had frequent occasion to allude, was born at Sienna, in Italy, A.D. 1487. He was of humble origin, and laboured under great disadvantages in early life. The deficiencies of his education, however, were amply compensated by the brilliancy of his genius; and few men ever possessed, in a more remarkable degree, the power of clothing their thoughts in striking and suitable language. He spoke his native tongue with such fluency and elegance, as at once to convince, and captivate every heart.

Ochinus entered the order of Franciscan Monks, called Cordeliers, at an early age; but some cause of dissatisfaction arising, he quitted that order in disgust, and began to devote himself to the study of Physic. On reflection, however, he resolved once more to assume the monkish habit, and lead a life of rigour and austerity. Accordingly, in the year 1534, he entered the order of Capuchins; and his conduct was so eminent for its piety and regularity, that

he was twice elected Vicar-general of the order—at Florence, in the year 1538, and at Naples in 1541. On the testimony of Ant. Mar. Gratiano, Bishop of Amelia, a zealous Catholic, Ochinus has been represented as the founder of this order. This Prelate, in his life of Cardinal Commendoni, relates that Ochinus, having observed great laxity in the discipline of the order of St. Francis, withdrew himself, for the purpose of living more according to its ancient strictness; and that, finding some of his brethren disposed to second his views, he restored the institutions of St. Francis in all their pristine vigour; and, in conjunction with Matthew D'Urbino, a man of extraordinary piety and sanctity, established the order of Capuchins. But this statement cannot be true, if, as we are told, Ochinus did not assume the habit of a Capuchin till 1534; for the establishment of this order took place in the year 1525, under the Pontificate of Clement VII., and in the year 1534, under the Pontificate of Paul III., the number of religious belonging to it amounted, if we are to believe Spondanus, to at least three hundred.

Ochinus is described, by all his biographers, as possessing an active and ingenious turn of mind, and a rich and fertile imagination. As a pulpit orator, it is said, that no man ever attained a higher degree of popularity. His preaching was the theme of admiration, not only with the vulgar, but also amongst persons of distinction and quality. Princes and Prelates were frequently in the number of his audience; and the first critics of Italy contended for the honour of having him as their Preacher. Charles V., who attended his preaching when in Italy, is reported to have said,—“That man would make the stones weep!” And Sadolet and Bembo, who were still more capable of appreciating his merits as a pulpit orator, assigned to him the palm of popular eloquence. At Perugia, the inhabitants

were induced, by his discourses, to lay aside their mutual animosities, and bring their law-suits to an amicable settlement; and at Naples, his appeal to the charitable feelings of his audience, on one occasion, was so effectual, that the almost incredible sum of five thousand crowns was collected at the close of the service.

Ochinus is represented as a man of singularly venerable aspect, with a long beard flowing gracefully down upon his breast, and a pale countenance, which bespoke the austerity of his mode of life. He was received as an inmate into the palaces of Princes and Nobles, where he observed the same rigour and abstinence, which habitually distinguished him. In his meals he confined himself to one dish, and that too of the plainest description; and abstained almost entirely from wine. He declined the use of the costly beds, and sumptuous apartments, which his hosts prepared for him, and reposed upon the bare ground, with no other covering than his own cloak; and so great was the reputation for sanctity which he had acquired throughout Italy, that the very mention of his name awakened a feeling of veneration in all who heard it. When he paid a visit to the palaces of Princes, or Bishops, he was always met and received with the honours due to one of superior rank. The reception which they gave him was more like that of a Sovereign Prince than of a poor monk; and when he took his departure from their houses, they insisted upon accompanying him on his way, and shewing him all those marks of attention, which they were in the habit of paying to persons of distinction alone.

It has been asserted, by some of the biographers of this singularly gifted man, but apparently without sufficient authority, that he was appointed Confessor to the Pope. A statement to this effect is made, with some degree of confidence, by Lubieniccus, which, however, is unsup-

ported by any direct evidence. Bayle regards the matter as extremely doubtful; and Sandius alludes to it only as a rumour. The fact is in itself unimportant, for the popularity of Ochinus was such, that, in the eyes of his numerous and devoted admirers, an appointment of this kind, however deservedly bestowed, could have thrown no additional splendour upon his character.

During one of his preaching excursions into the South of Italy, in the year 1541, Ochinus formed an intimacy with John Valdez and Peter Martyr; and so complete a change was wrought in him by his intercourse with these enlightened advocates of the principles of the Reformation, that he soon fell under the suspicion of heresy, and incurred the charge of having given utterance to sentiments, at variance with those of the Catholic Church. In the year 1542, he was appointed to preach at Venice during Lent, where he attracted, as usual, large and crowded audiences; but having introduced into his discourses topics at variance with the discipline of his Church, he was cited to appear before the Pope's Nuncio, and dismissed with a gentle reprimand. A short time after this, Julius of Milan, a disciple of Valdez, and an intimate friend of Ochinus, was committed to prison, by order of the Nuncio; and this harsh treatment of his friend drew from him the following spirited remonstrance: "What mode of proceeding is now left to us, Sirs? To what purpose do we undergo such troubles and hardships, O illustrious city, Queen of the Adriatic, if those who preach the truth are consigned to prison, shut up in dungeons, and loaded with chains and fetters? What security shall we have for our own persons? What free range will be left to truth? Would that the truth might be spoken candidly and openly! How many blind, who are now shut out from an enjoyment of the light, and enveloped in darkness, would then be illuminated!"

The Nuncio, incensed by these animadversions of Ochinus, immediately interdicted his preaching, and sent an account of the affair to the Pope: but the Venetians, who were great admirers of Ochinus's eloquence, prevailed upon the Nuncio, at the expiration of three days, to withdraw his interdict; and Ochinus, whose conduct was narrowly watched during the remainder of his stay at Venice, avoided all further use of irritating and offensive language.

When the term of his mission at Venice had expired, he proceeded to Verona, whither he summoned certain brethren of the Capuchin order, who were intended for the priesthood, with a view to their preparation for the sacred office. In pursuance of this design, he expounded to them the Epistles of Paul; but allowed himself unusual liberty in the course of his expositions. The Pope, who had hitherto been his friend, and who, it was supposed, had intended to raise him to the dignity of Cardinal, was now greatly incensed at his conduct, and issued an order for his appearance at Rome. He immediately set out on his way thither; but when he had proceeded as far as Bologna, he called upon his friend, Cardinal Contarini, who had recently returned from the Council of Ratisbon, and found him just upon the point of death. The Cardinal unbosomed himself freely to Ochinus, and informed him that, although he had strenuously resisted the Protestants on other points, he secretly agreed with them on the subject of Justification through Christ. While Ochinus was at Bologna, he abandoned his intention of proceeding to Rome, and hastened to Florence, to consult with his friend, Peter Martyr, whose advice he was anxious to procure in this emergency. This interview led to a determination, on the part of both, to leave Italy without delay;—a determination which was accelerated by a report, that Ochinus's arrival at Rome was to be the signal for his destruction, six Cardinals having

been appointed to sit in judgment upon him. Nor was this report a groundless one; for he afterwards learned, that a body of armed men was sent to Sienna and Florence, to seize and detain him.

The immediate cause of Ochinus's abrupt departure from Italy has been variously stated by different writers. Some have said, that, in a sermon delivered before the Pope on Palm Sunday, he alluded, in severe terms, to the pride of the Chief Pontiff, and contrasted it with the humility found in the character of Christ; and that, at the close of the discourse, one of the Cardinals informed him, that he had incurred the displeasure of his Holiness, and advised him instantly to seek safety by flight. We are also informed, that, in discoursing on the subject of the Trinity, he stated the arguments against that doctrine; but, under a pretext that the time was then too far advanced for him to proceed, delayed the refutation of them to a future opportunity, and, in the mean time, took his departure from Italy. Some Catholic writers, moreover, inform us, that he went over to the Protestant party, in consequence of having been disappointed in his expectation of obtaining a mitre, or a Cardinal's hat. But all these rumours are unworthy of credit; and the last, in particular, is altogether at variance with Ochinus's known character for integrity. It probably originated in the mortification felt by the Catholics, at his defection from their party; and may be set down as one of those stale devices, which writers, who are hardly pressed, seldom scruple to employ, in the course of controversial warfare.

Ochinus had many powerful friends in the North of Italy, whom he had attached to his cause, by the piety and integrity of his life, no less than by his brilliant and matchless eloquence, as a pulpit orator. Among these was the Duchess of Ferrara, who aided his flight to Venice, by

supplying him with a disguise, and furnishing him with the pecuniary provision necessary for his journey. From Venice he pursued his course to Geneva, where many Italian exiles had previously taken up their abode, and formed themselves into a separate religious society. Ochinus's motive for making choice of Geneva, as the place of his retreat, is said to have been a hope, that he might be elected Pastor of this little Church: but in this hope he appears, from some cause or other, to have been disappointed.

The departure of so celebrated, and justly popular a character, from his native country, and his renunciation of the doctrines of the Romish Church, were subjects of universal astonishment and regret amongst his Catholic friends. Cardinal Caraffa addressed an expostulatory letter to him, in which, after bestowing upon him the most extravagant encomiums, and calling him his "Father," he breaks out into the following exclamation: "O, infatuated old man! who has bewitched thee, that thou shouldst make to thyself another Christ, whom thou hast not learned from the Catholic Church!" Claudio Tolomeo, on hearing of his flight, addressed a letter to him, commencing with these words: "On returning from my villa to Rome a few days ago, I unexpectedly heard some news, which not only took me by surprise, but absolutely astounded me, by its absurdity and incredibility; for I was told, that, by some unaccountable means or other, you had been induced to go over from the Catholics to the Lutherans, and to give the sanction of your name to that heretical and impious sect. I was all consternation at this intelligence!" Other eminent individuals expressed themselves in terms equally honourable to the character of Ochinus, and equally descriptive of the sorrow which they felt at his change of opinion: but the brethren of the Capuehin order were

overwhelmed with grief, at the loss which they had sustained; and Boverius, their historian, tells his readers, that he could not refrain from tears, when he came to that part of his narrative, which related to this subject.

On the arrival of Ochinus at Geneva, he published a vindication of himself in three letters, of which one was addressed to the chief magistrate at Sienna, his native city; another to Claudio Tolomeo; and a third to Jerome Mutius. In this vindication, he animadverted, with considerable warmth and severity, upon the Pope, and all who still remained in communion with the Romish Church. In the years 1542 and 1543, he likewise printed, at the same place, two distinct volumes of Sermons, for the use and instruction of his countrymen in Italy. Calvin seems, at this time, to have extended his favour and protection to Ochinus; and even at a much later period to have held his character in high estimation. In a letter addressed to Melancthon, Feb. 14th, 1543, he writes thus: "We have among us Bernard of Sienna, a great and illustrious man, whose departure from Italy has excited no small commotion in that country." Some writers, nevertheless, affirm, that Calvin caused this "great and illustrious man" to be expelled from the city of Geneva; but in justice to the memory of the stern reformer, let us add, that the report appears to be entirely destitute of foundation.

Ochinus visited Castalio at Basle, in the year 1545; and proceeded, in the course of the same year, to Augsburg. Here he preached, in his native language, to a congregation, consisting principally of Italians. His pulpit addresses, which were a series of expositions, founded on the Epistles of Paul, displayed all his usual eloquence, and elicited universal admiration; and the substance of them was published, soon after their delivery, in the Latin and German languages. In 1547, however, the unsettled state of affairs,

at Augsburg, compelled him to leave the comfortable asylum, which he had found there, and return to Basle. But his stay at Basle was short; for in the same year he proceeded to Strasburg, where his friend, Peter Martyr, was then residing. In the course of the autumn, they both visited England, at the pressing solicitation of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. Peter Martyr was immediately appointed to a vacant Divinity Professorship at Oxford; and Ochinus, who brought with him letters of recommendation from his friend Curio, found employment as a Preacher to a congregation of Italian Protestants in London. The intention of the latter was to have spent the remainder of his life in England, but that intention was frustrated by the unlooked for death of Edward VI.; and the melancholy change which took place, on the accession of Mary, drove him, together with many other Italian exiles, from the kingdom.

During his residence in England, a work of his against the Pope was translated into English by "Master John Ponet," and bore the following title. "A Tragædie, or Dialogue of the unjust usurped Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, 1549," 4to. A copy of this translation is now in the Archiëpiscopal Palace at Lambeth. Ochinus's Sermons on Predestination and Election were also rendered into English, about the same time, by Anne Cooke, and printed in London by John Daye, A. D. 1550.

On the accession of Mary, Ochinus returned, by way of Strasburg, to Geneva, where he arrived on the 28th of October, 1553,—the day after the martyrdom of Servetus. During his stay at Geneva, on this occasion, he married; but his residence in that city was short. When he was informed of the cruel fate of Servetus, he expressed himself in such terms concerning it, as to leave no room for doubt, that it excited his just abhorrence. It appears

to have been this circumstance which induced him, very shortly, to quit Geneva for Basle, where some of his old friends were still residing; and where, as we are told, he supported himself, by following the profession of an author.

In 1555, after two years spent at Basle, Ochinus succeeded John Beccaria as Preacher to a congregation of Italians, who had recently been driven by persecution from Locarno, and compelled to take refuge in the territory of Zurich. The members of this little community came in a body to Zurich, at the beginning of the year, in quest of an asylum; and being ignorant of the German language, the Magistrate of that city appointed Beccaria to be their Minister, whose sufferings in the cause of Protestantism had already procured for him the title of *Apostle of the Locarnians*. When Beccaria had exercised the functions of Pastor among them for a few months, he was succeeded by Ochinus, who was installed in his office, at the earnest entreaties of the whole congregation, in the month of June, 1555.

Towards the close of that year, Ochinus sent into the world a Dialogue on the subject of Purgatory, which he dedicated to Francis Lismaninus, one of the earliest patrons of Unitarianism in Poland: but hitherto his own mind appears to have received no peculiar bias in favour of the Unitarian doctrine. In the year 1559, however, he visited Lismaninus, and seems to have embraced that doctrine, in the course of some private conferences, held upon the subject, at Pinczow. This fact, which is overlooked by his biographers, throws great light upon the history of his opinions, and enables us to account for the liberal tendency of his subsequent writings. For the knowledge of it we are indebted to "The Will of George Schomann," who says, "When I was present at Pinczow, in the year 1559, I lived upon familiar terms with Peter Statorius, John

Thenaud, Francis Lismaninus, George Blandrata, and Bernardine Ochinus, and became clearly convinced, that the doctrine of a perfect equality in the persons of the Trinity is founded in error, and forms no part of the Christian Faith; but that there is One God, the Father, One Son of God, and One Holy Spirit; although there were still many things relating to this subject, which we did not yet understand."

About two years after the occurrence, to which the above memorandum relates, Ochinus published a Catechism of the Christian Religion, which he inscribed to the members of his congregation at Zurich. This Catechism is so rare, that many for a long time doubted, whether it had ever been published. Its title, according to Vogt, was—"Il Catechismo, overo Institutione Christiana di M. Bernardino Ochino da Siena, in Forma di Dialogo, Interlocutori, il Ministro et Illuminato. Basil. 1561," 8vo. It was just such a production as might have been expected, after the conferences alluded to by George Schomann. The sentiments taught in it were, for the most part, of an orthodox complexion, but were occasionally interspersed with observations verging towards Antitrinitarianism, as well as with doubts concerning some points, deemed fundamental by the majority of Christians. Bayer, who had seen three copies of Ochinus's Catechism, in the libraries at Dresden, says, that its author, in most of his opinions, follows in the footsteps of the Lutherans; but is not entirely free from the errors of Socinus, and the scepticism of Des Cartes.

After the publication of his Catechism, it is probable, that the sentiments of Ochinus became still more liberal, till at last he entirely discarded all his remaining orthodox prepossessions. It is said that Queen Elizabeth, on her accession to the throne, had serious thoughts of inviting

him back to England, as the person most likely to compose the religious differences which existed, and settle the forms of English Protestantism. Had her intention upon this point been carried into effect, it is not, perhaps, too much to say, that the constitution of the Protestant Church of this country might have assumed a character, more in accordance with the spirit and teachings of the New Testament. Some orthodox Protestant writers have even gone so far, as to deem it a subject of congratulation, that this plan was frustrated; and to regard its failure as a providential deliverance from all possibility of taint, or contamination, from the Antitrinitarian opinions, which this great and good man is known to have imbibed after he left England.

In the year 1563, two volumes of Dialogues appeared in Latin under his name, which created a considerable sensation among the members of the Helvetic Churches. In the twenty-first of these Dialogues, the author brought forward several arguments in favour of Polygamy, for which he was banished from the state of Zurich, and turned adrift, in the midst of winter, with the whole of his family, at the advanced age of seventy-six. "The severe Doctors of the Helvetic Church," says a writer in the *Monthly Review*, (Vol. LXIII. p. 322,) "never made charity a fundamental article of their creed: and without sympathising in his misfortunes, they proceeded to damn his principles. They were not accustomed to seek for candid apologies in the infirmities of age, or the chagrin which ariseth from ill treatment; but finding him in an error, they applied the common argument of bitter zeal to correct it. The method they took with poor Ochinus was short, but irresistible; for they banished him at once from their state and Church, as the best method to preserve the peace and purity of both." But after all, it is by no means certain, that Ochi-

nus meant to defend Polygamy, or to do anything more than give a fair statement of the arguments for and against it. This, in fact, may be said to be the character of all his Dialogues, which are written in a spirit of the greatest impartiality; and in which, as Ruarus observes, “he disputes in the Academic manner, so that it is sometimes impossible to ascertain, whether he takes the part of the interrogator, or the respondent.” This led Beza, in his usual testy manner, to say, that, “Gentilis was less cunning than Ochinus, who seems, like the Academics, to doubt of everything, and to believe nothing.” But the truth is, that it was not so much on account of the Dialogue on Polygamy, as of those on the Trinity, that he fell under the displeasure of the Magistrates and Ministers of Zurich. In the eyes of these Protestant inquisitors, no greater crime could be committed, than to unravel the sophistry, by which the Trinity had so long maintained its ground in the Christian world; and Ochinus, who indirectly attacked this doctrine, was deemed guilty of an offence, for which no subsequent concessions could atone.

The Dialogues, thirty in number, were originally written in Italian; and afterwards translated into Latin, by Castalio, from the author’s manuscript. This latter fact is called in question by Ruarus, in a letter to Ab. Calovius; but Castalio himself vouches for its truth, in his exculpatory epistle to the Chief Magistrate and Senate of Basle. Calovius, however, was mistaken, in supposing that these Dialogues were published by Lælius Socinus, under the name of *Felix Turpio*. They were published in Ochinus’s own name. The first volume is dedicated to the Earl of Bedford, and the second to Prince Nicholas Radzivil; but the name *Felix Turpio* does not occur in any part of either volume. Bullinger informs us, in his Preface to the Works of Simler, that Ochinus “got them printed (*per Italum*

quendam) *through* a certain Italian, who was his intimate acquaintance and friend;" and this friend, it is supposed by Ruarus, was Peter Perna, whose name appears on the last page of each volume. "Lælius indeed," as Ruarus observes, "it could not be, for the Dialogues were published A.D. 1563, the year after his death." But may not the friend in question have been Cœlius Secundus Curio, to whose inspection they were submitted by the censor of the press, and by whom they were pronounced not unfit for publication? And may not Bullinger have expressed himself thus enigmatically, from a feeling of delicacy towards Curio, whose character was highly and universally respected, notwithstanding the freedom of his opinions on certain religious subjects? Curio, as we have already seen, was principally instrumental in their publication, but he escaped harmless; and in vain did Ochinus allege his ignorance of the law, which required that a manuscript, printed in another place, should be previously subjected to the censorship at Zurich. His Judges were peremptory; and it was decreed, that, having published a book, which ought to have been suppressed, and which had brought the Church, and the Republic into disrepute; and having, moreover, done this contrary to the laws, and edicts of the Magistrates, it was their will and pleasure, that he should immediately be expelled from the city and territory of Zurich. Bullinger states, in a letter to Simler, that an opportunity was given to Ochinus of retracting what he had written, but that, having no fair and legitimate excuse to offer, and declining to hold a disputation on the subjects on which he had given offence, he was dismissed by the Senate, and ordered to quit the country, with his whole family. In the proposal, to which Bullinger here alludes, there is, it must be admitted, some appearance of candour and fair-dealing;

but Ochinus knew the spirit in which it was made, and with characteristic prudence, declined the treacherous offer.

In compliance with the terms of the sentence passed upon him, he set out immediately for Basle, and entreated the Ministers and Professors of that place to intercede with the Magistrates on his behalf, and to procure permission for him to take up his abode in that city: but his application was unsuccessful, and he was not allowed to remain there even till spring. He then went to Mulhausen, with his children, in the depth of an unusually severe winter; but being still pursued by the malice of his enemies, he resolved, after a short residence in that town, to seek an asylum in Poland, where he hoped to find that protection, which was denied to him in Switzerland, and where he arrived in the month of May, 1564. Poland, however, did not afford him a permanent home; for it unfortunately happened, soon after the time of his entering that kingdom, that measures were adopted for the expulsion of all foreign Preachers, whose sentiments varied from the established creed; and Ochinus had become peculiarly obnoxious to the Catholics, not only on account of his change of sentiments, but also in consequence of an Apology, which he had published, abounding in charges of various kinds against the Romish Church. He officiated, for a short time, to a congregation of Italians, resident at Cracow; and Lubieniecius informs us, that some of the Nobles interested themselves on his behalf, and offered to procure the royal permission for him to remain in the kingdom; but that he refused, and said it was his wish to be obedient to the higher powers, though he should even perish by the road, amidst the wolves of the forests. Here, however, it should be observed, that Cardinal Borromeo, at the express request of the Pope, had written to Hosius and Commendoni,

urging them to use their influence, in procuring his expulsion from Poland; and that Beza had, at the same time, addressed a letter to the Reformed Churches of that country, entreating them to do the same. He therefore felt himself under the necessity of quitting Poland, and directed his steps towards Moravia. The plague detained him some time at Pinczow, on his way; but he found a kind friend in Jerome Philipovius, one of the early patrons of the Unitarians in Poland, who took him into his house, attended upon him with the greatest care during his illness, and supplied him with everything necessary to facilitate his recovery. For these humane attentions, he is said to have expressed his sense of obligation, at his departure, by saying, "I thank God, brother Philipovius, that He has rendered thee worthy of conferring a kindness upon Ochinus, in such distress!" Having lost three of his children by the plague, the poor old man pursued his weary way, and died within three weeks at Slacow, about twelve months after his barbarous expulsion from Switzerland.

Beza, in a letter to Dudithius, ascribes all the misfortunes which befel the family of Ochinus, and particularly the accidental death of his wife, to the special interposition of God, on account of his supposed erroneous opinions. To this unfeeling and presumptuous charge, Dudithius, with admirable judgment, thus replies: "It is customary, I perceive, with you, whenever any one meets with a miserable end, immediately to exclaim, that 'it has happened by the just judgment of God.' It is inhuman to trample upon the ashes of the dead; nor ought we to form an opinion of the piety of any one, from the manner of his death; else, what shall we say of Josiah and others? What shall we think of Christ and his Apostles, and an innumerable company of martyrs, who suffered an ignominious and excruciating death? What, too, shall we say in the case

of your own Zwingle? That illustrious herald of the word of God, and true disciple of Christ, is said to have been slain in the front of the battle; a miserable kind of death, and one which was unworthy of a Christian Teacher! Cease, then, thus to think with the vulgar, that, if a person meets with a violent and unexpected end, you are immediately at liberty to conclude, that he is an impious man!"

The published writings of Ochinus were as follow.

1. Sermons, 1542, 16mo. These Sermons, which were in Italian, were sixteen in number, and on the subject of Justification. Another volume appeared in 1543, 8vo., containing twenty-six Sermons. In 1562, a much larger collection was published at Basle, in Two Parts, 8vo.; Part I. containing fifty, and Part II. sixty-five Sermons. These were followed, in the course of the same year, by Part III., containing seventy-nine Sermons on Faith, Hope and Charity; Part. IV. containing fifty-one Sermons on the Soul, and various other subjects; and Part V., of the contents of which Vogt gives no particulars. In 1545, was published, in 4to., at Neuburg, on the Danube, a volume of Ochinus's Sermons, in German, on Justification, Good Works, Confession, Indulgences, Purgatory, and other Subjects, differing but little, in point of doctrine, from the published opinions of Luther. A reprint of this volume, with six additional Sermons, appeared at the same place, and in the same form, A.D. 1556. An English translation of twenty-five of Ochinus's Sermons on Election and Predestination, translated from the Italian by Anne Cooke, was also published in London, by John Daye, in 1550, 8vo.

2. A Tract "De Beneficio Christi," mentioned by Sandius, but not by Vogt, or Walchius.

3. An Exposition upon the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, 1545, 12mo., *Ital.* A Latin translation of this by

Castalio was published at Augsburg in 8vo.; and a German translation from the Latin, at the same place, in 1546, 8vo. Both these were from the press of Phil. Ulhart.

4. Three Sermons on the Duty of a Prince, *Ital.* A Latin version of these, by Cœlius Horatius Curio, was published at Basle, in 1550, 8vo.; to which were added Five Sacred Declamations, addressed to Edward VI., King of England, also translated from Italian into Latin, by C. H. Curio. Salig observes, that the Three Sermons on the Duty of a Prince were taken from Ochinus's published volumes of Sermons.

5. An Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, *Ital.* Of this Exposition a German version was printed at Augsburg, by Val. Othmar, 1546, 4to.

6. A Hundred Sacred Apologues, in Five Books, *Ital.* and *Lat.*, Geneva, 8vo. This edition is without date; but Aug. Bayer mentions another edition of the Italian, which was probably the first, and was published, by Gerard, at Geneva, 1554, 8vo. Of these Apologues, German and Dutch translations were published; the former, A.D. 1556—1559, 4to., and the latter, A.D. 1607, 8vo.

7. A Dialogue concerning Purgatory, *Ital.* and *Lat.*, Zurich, 1555, 8vo., Gesners. This Dialogue is inscribed to Francis Lismaninus; and the collocutors are Theodidactus, a Carmelite, a Franciscan, a Benedictine, a Dominican, and an Augustan Friar. A German version of it appeared at Zurich, in 1555, 8vo.; a French one in 1563; a Dutch one, of which Vogt does not give the date; and an English one at London, in 1657, 12mo.

8. On the Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Supper, in which there is a clever Treatise on the Origin and Errors of the Mass, and another on the Settlement of the Controversy among the Reformed Churches: to which we have added the Labyrinths of the same Author

on the Divine Prescience, and on Free-Will and Necessity: all now first translated out of Italian into Latin. Basle, 8vo. The Italian titles of the "Labyrinths," and the "Dispute on the Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Supper," are given by Vogt, (*Catal. Historico-Crit. Librorum Rariorum*, p. 495,) who leaves it to his readers to determine whether the latter is the same as the work, entitled, "*Sinceræ et veræ Doctrinæ de Cœna Domini Defensio, contra Libros iii. Joach. Westphali, Hamb. Past. Tigur. 1556,*" 8vo.

9. A Book on Polygamy, written in Poland, and dedicated to Sigismund II., King of Poland. This work is mentioned by Sandius, (*B. A.* p. 5,) on the testimony of Bzovius, under the year 1542, § 30.

10. Thirty Dialogues, divided into Two Books, of which the First is concerning the Messiah, and contains eighteen Dialogues; and the Second on various other Subjects, but principally the Trinity. Basle, Peter Perna, 1563, 8vo., *Lat.* The first Book is dedicated to the Earl of Bedford; and the second to Prince Nicholas Radzivil. These Dialogues, like all the works of Ochinus, were written originally in Italian. Castalio rendered them into Latin. They were also translated into Dutch, and various other languages.

11. A Catechism, 1561, Basle, 8vo., *Ital.* Doubts have been expressed by many writers, whether Ochinus ever wrote a Catechism; but Vogt mentions several copies of it, which existed in his time in private, as well as public libraries. (*Catal.* pp. 490, 491.) Its title is, "*Il Catechismo, overo Instituzione Christiana di M. Bernardino Ochino da Siena, in Forma di Dialogo, Interlocutori, il Ministro et Illuminato.*" Aug. Bayer says, that he read the explanation of the sixth Commandment, but found nothing in it on the subject of Polygamy.

12. A Letter, in which Ochinus gives the Reason of his Departure from Italy. Venice, 1542, 8vo., *Lat.* This Letter was composed in Italian. A French version of it, with another Letter of Ochinus, appeared in 1544, 8vo.

13. The Acts of Pilate. These Acts are mentioned by Reimannus and Deckher; and are classed by the latter among Atheistical writings.

The great scarcity of Ochinus's works has been the theme of bibliographers for upwards of two centuries. They were all rigidly suppressed, on account of the alleged heresies of their author, and his severe satires against the Church of Rome. Further accounts of them may be seen in the works of Vogt and Walchius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 2—6. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* OCHIN. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. C. ii. § xiii. pp. 483—532, et *passim*. *Trechsel*, Lelio Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit. Heidelb. 1844, 8vo. Vierter Abschnitt, S. 202—276. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. *Art.* OCHIN ou OKINI. *M'Crie's* Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Ch. iii. pp. 135—144, and *passim*. *Ruari* Epp. Cent. i. N. 46, 47. *Walchii* Bibl. Theol. T. I. p. 923; T. II. pp. 119. 258. 432. 1156. *Vogt*, Catal. Libr. Rar. pp. 490—499. *Schellh.* Amœn. Lit. T. III. pp. 152, 153. *Fal. Smalcii* Diarium; apud *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Suppl. p. 1162, Not. a, etc.

13.

LÆLIUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) whom Moreri calls “the Patriarch of Socinianism,” was born at Sienna, in Tuscany, A.D. 1525; and educated under the eye of his father, Marianus Socinus, the younger. Many members of this family had raised themselves to the highest distinction in the legal profession. Bartholomew, the great uncle of Lælius; Marianus Senior, his great grandfather; and Marianus Junior, his father, were all eminent as lawyers. The last of these, who was called “Princeps Jurisconsultorum,” married Camilla, daughter of Paul Salvetti; and the offspring of this union was a

family of ten sons, and three daughters. Of these the only names, which have come down to our times, in addition to that of Lælius, are Alexander, Camillus, Celsus, Philip and Cornelius. It is not known in what order the sons were born; but it has been ascertained, that Lælius was one of the younger, and that he was the junior of his brother Alexander by fifteen years.

Lælius received the rudiments of his education at Padua, from which city, at the age of fifteen, he went with his family to Bologna, where he appears to have remained till the year 1546. He was destined by his father for the study of the Law, which, as we have already seen, was the favourite profession of the family; and in which he would probably have emulated the fame of his ancestors, had he not been carried away, at an early period of his life, by the reforming spirit of the age. But on reading the Scriptures, he found them so much at variance with the dogmas of the Romish Church, that he determined to throw off the trammels of human authority, and judge for himself.

It has been affirmed, that Servetus, Ochinus and Camillus Siculus, were among the number of his religious instructors; but this is not to be understood, as though he attended them personally, while they were in Italy. He is said to have been their disciple, merely because he evinced a partiality for some of the doctrines, which they had been instrumental in propagating. They had all left Italy when he was a mere child; and although he afterwards met with Camillus Siculus in the Valteline, and formed an intimate acquaintance with him, there is no evidence to prove, that he had enjoyed the benefit of Camillus's personal instructions before that time.

His early classical studies were confined wholly to the Latin language, of which he obtained an accurate knowledge, so as to be able to read the Vulgate with ease and

fluency. But as he grew up, he became conscious of the disadvantage under which he laboured, in being ignorant of Greek. He longed to peruse the Scriptures in the languages in which they were originally written, and with that view formed the determination to make himself master both of the Greek and Hebrew; a determination, which he carried into effect with great zeal and ardour. He was induced to give the more attention to the study of these languages, by the great interest which the Reformation had excited throughout the countries of Europe, not excepting even benighted, and priest-ridden Italy.

Whether he led the way in the formation of that religious system, which was afterwards distinguished by the name of *Socinianism*, or trod in the footsteps of preceding inquirers, is a question which is not yet placed entirely beyond the reach of controversy. Sandius, and some later writers, incline to the former opinion; but others have contended, that the mind of Lælius received the first impulse towards those peculiar views, which were afterwards taken up by his nephew Faustus, and zealously propagated by him, from his intercourse with Camillus Siculus, who was the main support of the Anabaptists in the North of Italy, towards the middle of the sixteenth century. Camillus denied the existence of three persons in the divine essence; and for holding this, and other opinions deemed heretical, he was excluded from the communion of the orthodox Churches in the Valteline, which he had joined about the year 1542. Camillus, however, had many zealous followers; and he is said, by De Porta, to have traced the outlines of that religious system, which was afterwards filled up by Lælius and Faustus Socinus. Still it is not improbable, that the mind of Lælius had received an Antitrinitarian bias before he left Italy.

When he had arrived at the age of manhood, he quitted

Bologna, and went into the Venetian territory, where a degree of religious freedom existed, which was unknown in other parts of Italy; and where not only the writings of Luther and Melanchthon were extensively read, but those of Servetus had also found their way, as appears from a letter addressed by Melanchthon to the Senate of Venice, in the year 1539. Among those who had embraced the opinions of Servetus, either wholly or in part, there were at that time many persons of distinguished rank, and eminent attainments, in the city of Venice. These opinions, however, were not openly tolerated by the Senate, the members of which, though favourable to some reform in the Catholic Church, were not prepared to throw off the papal yoke. The result was, that secret meetings were held by those who adopted, or patronized the new views; and when Lælius went into the Venetian territory, he soon became enamoured of these views, and embraced them with all the ardour and ingenuousness of a youthful mind, bent upon the pursuit and acquisition of religious truth.

Antitrinitarian writers relate, that he, in conjunction with about forty others, who had embraced the principles of the Reformation, instituted a society at Vicenza, with branches in other cities of the Venetian territory, the object of which was, to free the Christian religion from the errors which had crept into it, and to restore the Church to its original purity. Among the subjects discussed by them, Sandius expressly mentions the Trinity, and the doctrine of Satisfaction. The same writer further informs us, that the existence of this society being made known, some of its members were seized, and put to death, while others were fortunate enough to make their escape, and found an asylum in foreign countries.

Gustavus George Zeltner was the first person, who attempted to throw doubts upon the authenticity of this

account, by insinuating, that some of the circumstances connected with it stood in need of further elucidation. (Hist. Crypto-Soc. Altorf. Cap. ii. § 41, p. 321, Not. b.) Mosheim, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, (Instit. Hist. Christ. Recentioris, Hemlst. 1741, 8vo. pp. 309—311,) and Wannfred Von Camben, (Allgemeine Staats-, Kriegs-, Kirchen- und Gelehrten- Chronike, 7 B, Leipz. 1739, fol.) afterwards took up the subject. The former of these did not find anything in the history itself, which he had any difficulty in believing; but was rather induced to admit its probability. He scrupled not, however, to call in question what was said about some of the members of this society, and the nature of the subjects discussed by them. The latter, in correcting some errors, which occurred in the 7th Vol. of “The Leipzig Universal Chronicle,” took occasion to observe, that the whole narrative was a tissue of falsehood; and attempted to substantiate his assertion by arguments, which, however, do not appear to have satisfied Mosheim.

Some time afterwards, Bock entered upon a diligent, and laborious investigation of the subject; and attempted not only to shew, that the account of this society was worthy of credit, but also to refute the arguments of Von Camben, and to reply to the doubts raised by Mosheim. (Hist. Socinianismi Prussici, p. I, sqq. Hist. Antitrin. Tom. II. pp. 395—426.) But although he brought together many facts, tending to throw light upon the subject, and to confirm the narrative of Sandius, and the other Unitarian historians who have adverted to it, he left other things unexplained, which have since been cleared up by Dr. Christ. Fred. Illgen, in his “Symbolæ ad Vitam et Doctrinam L. Socini illustrandam.”

For our knowledge respecting the society at Vicenza, we are indebted mainly to Andrew Wissowatius, Jun.;

Christopher Sandius, Jun.; and Stanislaüs Lubieniecus, Jun. The last of these writers informs us, that his account was derived from a life of Lælius Socinus, entitled "*Vitæ Læli. Socini Curriculum*," and from the manuscript "*Commentaries of Stanislaüs Budzinius*:" but Wissowatius and Sandius are silent as to the authorities, from which their accounts were taken. There seems, however, no reason to doubt, that they obtained their information either from a manuscript copy of Lubieniecus's "*History of the Polish Reformation*," (which was in private circulation some years before it was printed,) or from the books consulted by that writer, in the composition of his history. Wissowatius being the grandson of Faustus Socinus, it is highly probable that a copy of the "*Life of Lælius Socinus*," above alluded to, was carefully preserved, as a family document; and Sandius unquestionably had access to the "*Commentaries of Budzinius*," the title of which he gives, at full length, in the 55th page of his "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*," besides making several quotations from them elsewhere.

But why should we be under any particular anxiety to trace the sources, from which these three writers derived their information on this subject? What possible inducement could they have had to invent such a narrative, and palm it upon the world? Their veracity as historians is not impeached upon other subjects: why should it be called in question on this? Surely it will not be said, that their anxiety to trace the Unitarian doctrine to an early source, induced them to fabricate this story; for the advocates of that doctrine invariably contended, that it dates its commencement from the apostolic age, and alluded to the society at Vicenza, merely as an institution, designed to restore to their original purity those parts of the Christian religion, into which corruptions had crept. Nor is it a

circumstance, which in any degree affects the credibility of these writers, that their accounts are not corroborated by other historians; for human testimony, like everything else human, has its limits, and if the evidence which we possess on this, or any other given subject, be of an open and unsuspicious character, three witnesses to the truth of a statement are as good as three hundred. Contemporaneous Italian writers, it is true, have not made mention of the existence of such a society: but for this omission many reasons may be assigned. It was in its very nature secret; and when its existence was discovered, the members of it precipitately fled into other countries, with the exception of one or two, who were immediately seized, and put to death without mercy, as heretics. Besides, the Senate of Venice would take care, that nothing, which was advanced against the received doctrines of the Romish Church, in a society of this kind, should be made public; and particularly at a time, when the principles of the Reformation were daily gaining strength, and extending their influence in all directions.

But supposing that Italian writers had been acquainted with the history of this society, it is very doubtful, whether they would have thought it desirable to take any notice of it. Some would probably be induced to look upon it as a matter of temporary interest, and to regard it as having no peculiar claims upon the attention of posterity, since it was no new thing in Italy to deal summarily with heretics: others might refrain from disclosing the topics discussed by the members of this society, lest, by so doing, they should be instrumental in awakening a spirit of inquiry: while others still might be unwilling to incur the personal risk, attendant upon such a disclosure, and consult their own safety, by passing it over in silence. That historians, living at the time, were under any literary or moral obliga-

tion to notice the existence, or record the fate of this society, is an assumption altogether destitute of any rational foundation. Indeed, we may apply to the history of this society in particular, the remarks which Dr. M'Crie makes, in reference to the history of the Reformation in Italy generally. "Unfortunately, none of the Italian Protestants in the sixteenth century thought of recording the facts connected with the religious movement which issued in their expulsion from their native country. On the other hand, writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion appear to have agreed, from an early period, to pass over a subject at once dangerous to themselves, and ungrateful to their countrymen; or, if they did touch it, to represent any agitation which took place as exceedingly slight and transient, and as produced by a few individuals of no note or consideration, who had suffered themselves to be led astray by fondness for novelty." (Pref. p. vi.)

The learned author of the foregoing observations refers to Dr. Illgen, as admitting the general truth of the account given by Lubieniecus, Wissowatius and Sandius, but at the same time as acknowledging its incorrectness as to particular facts (Chap. iv. p. 183, 2nd Ed.); and, in corroboration of this statement, he refers to Illgen's "*Vita Lælii Socini*," (pp. 8—14,) which was published in the year 1814. But Illgen afterwards published his "*Symbolæ*," in the former part of which he went more fully into the subject than any preceding writer had done, and proved that Lubieniecus, Wissowatius and Sandius, on whose testimony the account mainly rests, are authors of unimpeachable veracity; that the account which they give is probable in itself; and that the arguments, adduced for the purpose of discrediting that account, particularly those of Von Camben, are trifling and unsatisfactory.

The names of the persons compromised, as members of

the society of Vicenza, have not all been preserved; but the following are mentioned, as forming part of the number. Leonard Bucalis, or Busalis; Lælius Socinus; Bernardine Ochinus; Nicholas Paruta; John Valentine Gentilis; Julius Trevisanus; Francis de Ruego; James de Chiari; Francis Niger; Darius Socinus; and John Paul Alciati. Whether all these were present at the conferences, which took place in the year 1546, is, to say the least, doubtful. That Ochinus and Niger left Italy before that year, we are assured, upon undoubted authority; nor is there any sufficient reason for supposing, that they returned in a clandestine manner, for the purpose of attending these meetings, although Niger was not at such a distance from Italy, as to render a visit of this kind impracticable. That Ochinus was at Venice in 1542, a short time before his flight to Geneva, and that he was afterwards in habits of familiar intercourse with many members of the society of Vicenza, and especially with Lælius Socinus, are well attested facts; but the circumstance of his absence from Italy in 1546, affords a strong presumption, that he was not a member. Nor must the fact be overlooked, that Sandius, who, in his "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*," (p. 18,) mentions Ochinus, as one of those, who were reported to have belonged to the society at Vicenza, expresses himself doubtfully upon this point, in the Appendix to his "*Nucleus Hist. Eccles.*," (p. 90,) where he says,—“*An inter eosdem fuerit Bernard. Occhinus, qui anno circiter 1546 in Italiæ ditione Veneta apud Vicentiam colloquia ac collegia frequentarunt, certo asserere non ausim.*”

Mosheim admits, that the existence of such a society as the one now under consideration is far from improbable; that the territory of Venice may have been the scene of its deliberations; that its assemblies may have been interrupted and dispersed by the vigilance of the papal emissaries.

ries; that some of its members may have been apprehended and put to death; and that the rest may have saved themselves by flight. But he regards it as extremely improbable, if not absolutely incredible, that all the persons, who are said to have been present at these assemblies, were really so. This, as we have just seen, was the case with Ochinus, and not improbably too with Niger. The same, according to Mosheim, may be confidently affirmed with respect to Lælius Socinus.

“How,” he asks, “can we suppose that a young man, only one-and-twenty years old, would leave the place of his nativity, repair to Venice or Vicenza, and that without any other view than the pleasure of disputing freely on certain points of religion?” (*Institut. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. Pars. ii. C. iv. § vii. Not. f, p. 712.*) But it is not affirmed that Lælius did “leave the place of his nativity,” and repair to the Venetian territory, for the mere pleasure of disputing freely on certain points of religion. His native place was Sienna; but he was educated at Padua and Bologna, and resided with his family, in the latter city, for the space of six or seven years, down to the very time when he went into the Venetian territory. This was in the year 1546; and why a young man, who had just attained his majority, and who is said to have detected many errors of the Romish Church, by an attentive perusal of the Scriptures, and to have been inflamed by the most ardent desire of making himself acquainted with everything relating to the study of the Christian religion, should not have left the place in which he had been brought up, and have repaired to Venice, or Vicenza, or elsewhere, without any other view than the mere pleasure of disputing freely on points of religion, it is difficult to conceive. “Is such a supposition really so absurd?” is the pertinent inquiry of Mosheim’s translator, Dr. Maclaine. “Is not a

spirit of enthusiasm, or even an uncommon degree of zeal, adequate to the production of such an effect?"

But it is again objected, as in the highest degree improbable, "that a youth of so much inexperience should acquire such a high degree of influence and authority, as to obtain the first rank, and the principal direction, in an assembly composed of so many eminently learned and ingenious men," as the society at Vicenzâ. (*Ibid.*) We are simply told, however, that he united with more than forty other friends of religious freedom, in the formation of this society, from which it is not to be inferred, that it was under his individual direction and control; although there is nothing incredible in the supposition, that he took a more active part, than some of its members, in the promotion of the cause, for which it was instituted. This, indeed, is precisely what might have been expected, from a young man of talent and spirit, like Lælius.

It is once more objected, however, "that it was the desire of improvement, and the hope of being aided in his inquiries after truth, by the conversation of learned men in foreign nations, that induced him to leave Italy, and not the apprehension of persecution and death;" and "that he returned into his native country afterwards, and, in the year 1551, remained some time at Sienna, while his father lived at Bologna:"—and it is further represented as what "cannot easily be imagined, that a man in his senses would return to a country, from which, but a few years before, he had been obliged to fly, in order to avoid the terrors of a barbarous inquisition, and a violent death." (*Ibid.*) But it was not the love of truth alone,—it was an apprehension of danger to his own person, which was the immediate cause of his departure from Italy; and when he revisited that country, we know that it was secretly, and at the hazard of his life. It may have been imprudent to venture

upon such a step; but we can easily suppose, that a young man, who had been some years separated from the members of his own family, would be willing to incur some risk, in seeking to obtain an interview with them.

Lælius did not leave Italy till 1547, the year following the dispersion of the society at Vicenza; and hence again it has been inferred, that he could not have been a member of that society. But he is said to have lain concealed among his friends for some months, and to have waited for an opportunity of withdrawing himself, when the danger should be in some measure past. That he could not have continued long in Italy with safety, is evident from the treatment, to which those of his friends had been exposed, who were so unfortunate as to fall into the hands of the Pope's emissaries. But whether it was through fear of danger, as is commonly believed, or with the sole desire of improving himself; or whether it was both these objects combined; it is certain that he left Italy about the age of twenty-two, and travelled, by a circuitous route, into Switzerland, whither many Italians of eminence had gone before him, in the expectation of being allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences,—a privilege which was denied them, as long as they remained in their native land.

He visited the country of the Grisons in 1547, and remained there for some months, upon terms of intimacy with Camillus Siennus, the leader of the so-called Anabaptist party. This happened to be just at the time, when the dispute between Camillus and Mainardi, respecting the use and efficacy of the Sacrament, was rife. Lælius openly took part with neither, but maintained a prudent silence. Notwithstanding his intimacy with Camillus, he continued upon good terms with Mainardi, with whom he exchanged letters, after he left Chiavenna.

From Chiavenna he went to Geneva, for the purpose of cultivating an acquaintance with Calvin and Beza, who were the leaders of the reformed party in that city; but his stay at Geneva was short, for he was anxious to visit the other countries of Europe, in which the Reformation had made some progress, and with this view passed over from Switzerland into France, and thence into Great Britain.

In France there were several learned and intelligent men, who were anxious to see the Christian religion freed from the errors which it had contracted, and restored to its primitive purity: but the Doctors of the Sorbonne laboured, with all their might, to frustrate the attempts, which were made for this purpose, and the severe measures adopted to stifle inquiry, together with the recent fate of Stephen Dolet, who had been put to death in the year 1545, on account of his religious opinions, induced Lælius to hasten his departure out of a country, in which the professors of liberal principles were constantly exposed to the most imminent danger. Dr. Priestley, in his "General History of the Christian Church from the Fall of the Western Empire to the present Time," (Vol. IV. Period xxiii. Sect. x. p. 136,) mentions one JOHN DU BARD, a *Socinian* Minister, who had published and defended his opinions at Poitiers, but afterwards made a public retractation, in a full Synod of the Reformed, A.D. 1565. Whether this was the result of conviction, or of clerical intimidation, we are not told. It was most probably the latter; for the Reformed in France were at that time friends to the arbitrary power of the Crown, and maintained that it was lawful for the Civil Magistrate to punish heretics.

In England, attempts had been made to reform the Church, under the auspices of Cranmer, assisted by Martin

Bucer, Paul Fagi, Peter Martyr, Bernardine Ochinus, Emmanuel Tremellius, and John a Lasco, whose acquaintance and friendship, in all probability, Lælius was studious to cultivate. We know, indeed, that he afterwards carried on a friendly correspondence with Martyr and Ochinus. But the Reformation, even in England, had been by no means carried out to its full extent. Passing over, therefore, into Holland, and finding that there also reputed heretics were exposed to severe persecution, he determined, after a short stay, to return to Switzerland.

Having arrived at Basle, he formed an acquaintance with Munster, the Hebrew Professor, and Castalio, the Professor of Greek; as well as with Cœlius Secundus Curio, who had been appointed to the Professorship of Belles Lettres and History, in the University of that city. But at Zurich there were also many learned men, and distinguished lights of the Reformation, among whom Bullinger and Pellican stood preëminent. Lælius was kindly received by both these, and took up his abode with the latter, to whom a letter of recommendation, bearing date Oct. 8th, 1548, had been addressed by Nicholas Maier, Ambassador of the Prince of Wirtemberg, at the court of Bologna. In this letter he is described as “a very pious and learned young man, a native of Sienna in Italy, a Patrician, and one who was travelling on account of the faith in Christ.”

Soon after his arrival in Switzerland, he began to evince the inquisitive turn of his mind, by proposing to Calvin questions such as the following: Whether it is lawful to marry a woman, who is not of the true faith; or, at least, one who dare not, through fear, openly avow the real convictions of her mind? Whether Papal Baptism is valid? Whether it is criminal to dissemble one's faith through fear of danger? and Whether the dead are to rise, clothed with new bodies? From the tenor of his question respect-

ing the validity of Papal Baptism, Illgen infers, that he had imbibed the well-known opinions of the Anabaptists, during his residence in the country of the Grisons; for Lælius scruples not to declare his conviction, when propounding this question, that Papal Baptism, not being celebrated in an assembly of the pious, is a nullity. Calvin's answers were not deemed satisfactory by his interrogator, who appears still to have entertained doubts respecting the resurrection of the body, and to have continued his correspondence with Calvin on this, and the other questions above enumerated. His motive in reiterating these inquiries, according to Illgen, was either mere curiosity, or a desire of knowing, as he had quitted the communion of the Catholic Church, how far it was allowable to hold intercourse with the members of that Church. But the inquisitiveness of his disposition at length became offensive to Calvin, who thus concludes a letter to him, dated Dec. 26th, 1549. "If you want to know more, you must look for information elsewhere; for you will never induce me to overleap the bounds prescribed by the Lord, in compliance with your humour. Pardon me, too, if I am more reserved than you wish on other matters."

Finding so little sympathy with his views in Switzerland, he turned his attention towards Germany. He had long contemplated a visit to Melancthon at Wittenberg, which he at length accomplished; but there is some difficulty in ascertaining its duration, and the precise time of its commencement. Joachim Camerarius, Peter Melius, Theodore Beza, Samuel Przypcovius, and the Polish and Transylvanian Ministers, to whom Sandius often refers, allude to the fact, without mentioning the time. Hoornbeek, John Henry Hottinger, and Christian Aug. Salig state, in general terms, that Lælius was three years at Wittenberg, without defining the time more accurately. But Godfrey

Arnold, and John James Hottinger say, that it was from 1550 to 1552; while John Dietrich Hartmann, and John Matthias Schröckh suppose it to have been from 1548 to 1550. Others, as Lauterbach and Bock, count the three years from 1548 to the middle of 1551; and in this opinion Illgen acquiesced, when he published his "Life of Lælius Socinus" in 1814. But he afterwards saw reason to change his opinion; and in the 2nd Part of his "Symbolæ" he has satisfactorily proved, that the stay of Lælius at Wittenberg was not quite one whole year, extending from the month of July 1550 to that of June 1551. In the middle of June 1550 he was at Zurich, as appears from a letter addressed by Oswald Myconius, a celebrated Divine of Basle, to Melanchthon; and on the 6th of July in the same year, as we learn from a letter of his own to Bullinger, he was at Nuremberg, on his way to Leipzic, but intending to pass the winter at Wittenberg. (Symb. P. ii. pp. 17, 18.) His stay at Leipzic, however, must have been short; for we find, from a letter of Melanchthon's, written July 19th, 1550, and addressed to Jerome Baumgartner, that he had then arrived at Wittenberg. (Ibid.)

He was politely received by Melanchthon, who immediately conducted him to John Forster, Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg, at whose house he lodged during the remainder of that year, and the spring of 1551; and under whose superintendence he studied Hebrew and Arabic. On the 26th of Sept., 1550, he entered his name on the books of the University, as *Lælius Sozinus, Senensis Italus*, to which words, as Illgen was informed by Heubner, Professor of Theology at Wittenberg, the following were added by a later hand,—*Mariani Sozini Jconsulti præstantissimi filius*.

Melanchthon, probably owing to some private intimation from Calvin, seems at first to have regarded him with

some degree of distrust; for, in a letter addressed to Camerarius, and written on the 25th of July, 1550, a few days after the arrival of Lælius at Wittenberg, he says, “the son of Socinus is often with us, but he is the fellow-lodger of Forster, and I wish him back in Switzerland.” This feeling, however, was soon dissipated; for Lælius’s diligence in searching after truth, and his anxiety to understand the sacred writings, and to obtain a more accurate acquaintance with the theological controversies of the day, so wrought upon the kindly nature of this distinguished reformer, that he treated him as a brother, disclosed to him his inmost thoughts, and entertained him for three months as a visiter at his own house.

When the object of Lælius in visiting Wittenberg was answered, he spent a few months in Poland and Moravia. Unitarianism had then made little, or no progress in Poland; and though it is said, that he completed the conversion of Lismaninus, during his short stay in that country, he seems to have offered no public opposition to any of the received doctrines. In Moravia he probably saw Paruta, Darius Socinus, and other Antitrinitarians, who had taken refuge there, when driven by persecution from their own country.

On his return to Switzerland, at the end of the year 1551, he went to Geneva; but disapproving of the austerity of Calvin, who had caused Bolsec to be committed to prison, for impugning the stoical doctrine of Fate, and saying, that the doctrine of Predestination made God the author of sin, he passed on to Zurich, where his friends Bullinger and Pellican resided, whose nature was milder, and more in accordance with his own.

Bolsec was not singular in the view, which he took of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. Castalio and others rejected it; and Melanchthon himself blamed “the stoical paradoxes concerning Necessity, as both disrespectful

towards God, and injurious to good morals." But Lælius, though he could not follow Calvin in his stern and merciless doctrines, continued to ply him with questions on religious subjects; and his importunity at length brought down upon him the heavy displeasure of Calvin, who wrote him an angry letter, in which he said: "It grieves me exceedingly, that the fine talents, which the Lord has bestowed upon you, should not only be unprofitably employed on things of no moment, but wasted on pernicious fictions. What I have long since declared, I seriously warn you of again, that, unless you soon correct this impertinent curiosity, it is to be feared, that you will bring upon yourself heavy calamities. * * The time will come, as I hope, when you will be glad, that you have been so violently roused." Here it is intimated, in no very obscure terms, that, if Lælius pushed his inquiries any further, he must expect no mercy at the hands of Calvin. But the ardour of Lælius's mind was not to be repressed, by such dark and mysterious allusions to the consequences, in which his inquisitive turn of mind might ultimately involve him. He remonstrated with his correspondent mildly, but firmly, on the harshness of his judgment, and the severity of his language; and Melancthon, writing to Camerarius on the 1st of Feb. in the same year, says, (no doubt in reference to what had passed during the preceding month,) "Lælius tells me, that he has written to a certain Coryphæus, not to contend so vehemently," and adds, "the men of Zurich are gentler."

In the summer of 1552, we find Lælius venturing upon a journey into Italy, for the purpose of visiting his father at Bologna. On this occasion he had P. P. Vergerius for a fellow-traveller; but the imminent danger which threatened him soon induced him to return, and it is doubtful whether he saw his father or not. In the course of this

journey he renewed his intimacy with Camillus Siculus, with whose doctrine he was not a little delighted; and who raised in his mind considerable doubts respecting certain articles of faith, deemed fundamental by many, and especially respecting the merits of Christ, and the Sacraments. From this, however, it does not follow, that he embraced the whole of Camillus's doctrine.

After his return into Switzerland, he again visited Geneva, in the year 1553; and was there at the time when Servetus was cast into prison. It has even been said, (but for this statement there appears to be no sufficient authority,) that he was a spectator of the martyrdom of Servetus. It is certain, however, that this event excited his just indignation; and Illgen attributes to him a work on the treatment of heretics, published under the feigned name of Martin Bellius, which he supposes him to have written about this time, either at Geneva, or Zurich. On this work more will be said hereafter. At present it may be sufficient to observe, that Lælius, disgusted at the conduct of the Genevese clergy in the affair of Servetus, left the canton, and returned to Zurich, where he found men more after his own heart.

Here he took up his abode with Pellican, under whom he resumed the study of the Hebrew language. But not content with the opportunity of improvement, which his renewed personal intercourse with such men as Bullinger and Pellican afforded him, he entered into an active correspondence with the most celebrated Theologians of Switzerland and Germany, as Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, Brentius, Musculus, Munster, Zanchius, Curio, Martyr, Vergerius, Castalio, and others. In undertaking this correspondence, he was actuated not by a mere fondness for disputation, but by an ardent love of truth, and a determination, if possible, to arrive at some definite conclusion on those sub-

jects, which had so long occupied his attention, and to the investigation of which he devoted all the powers of his energetic and upright mind. The state of his feelings at this time cannot be better expressed than in his own words. “Ego vero esse in dies magis ostendi cupio, et mihi firmitus persuaderi, ut amore possim Deo meo vehementius adhærere, et, lites verborum, concertationes opinionum, spinosas quæstiones, labyrinthos inextricabiles deserendo, acquiescere in ipsa Dei veritate simplicissima.”

From the letters, which passed at this time between Lælius and his correspondents, who were confessedly among the greatest lights of the age, it appears, beyond all doubt, that the opinions professed by his friend, Camillus Siculus, had taken firm hold on his own mind; and we discover, in these opinions, the germs of that system, which was afterwards developed by his nephew, Faustus, and which obtained from him the name of *Socinianism*. Dr. M'Crie, when adverting to the causes, which induced Lælius to abandon the orthodox creed, attributes great influence to his interviews with Camillus at Chiavenna; and then goes on to say: “Soon after his arrival in Switzerland he began, in his conversations and epistolary correspondence with learned men, to start doubts as to the commonly received opinions concerning the Sacraments and the Resurrection, and afterwards concerning Redemption and the Trinity; but he uniformly proposed these in the character of a learner, not of a teacher or disputant, as difficulties which he was anxious to have solved, and not as sentiments which he held, or wished to support. The modesty with which he propounded his doubts, together with the eager desire he shewed for knowledge, his courteousness, and the correctness of his morals, gained him the esteem not only of Melancthon and Bullinger, but also of Calvin and Beza. If, at any time, he gave offence or alarm by the boldness with

which he pushed his speculations into high and inscrutable mysteries, or by pertinaciousness in urging his objections, he knew how to allay these feelings by prudent concession, and ample apologies; and Calvin, after declining farther correspondence with him, was induced to renew it, and return a friendly answer to his doubts respecting the doctrine of the Trinity. In adopting this method toward the more learned reformers, it was probably the object of Socinus to ascertain what they could say against his opinions; but, in other instances, he exerted himself in secretly making proselytes, and not without success. He carefully concealed his sentiments respecting the Trinity from the Divines of Zurich. On receiving warning from the Grisons, Bullinger, whose affections he had gained, laid the matter before him, and, in a very friendly manner, advised him to remove the suspicions which had arisen as to his orthodoxy. Socinus protested that he agreed in all points with the Church of Zurich, and complained of the reports circulated to his prejudice; but, on being dealt with more closely, he owned that he had indulged too much in abstruse and vain speculations, promised that he would guard against this for the future, and subscribed a declaration of his faith, which was satisfactory to Bullinger. Julio da Milano, who was one of those from whom the information had come, and knew the correspondence which Socinus held with the Antitrinitarians in the Valteline, was suspicious of the sincerity of his professions; and though he promised to use his influence to induce his brethren to accept of the pledge which had been given, implored Bullinger to watch over the purity of the Locarnese congregation. After this, Socinus was more circumspect: we find no more noise made about his opinions during his life-time; and there is every reason to think that he continued to communicate, as he had formerly done, with the Italian Church in Zurich.

But after his death, the Antitrinitarians who had enjoyed his confidence, thinking themselves no longer bound to secrecy, proclaimed that he was of their sentiments; and as a proof of this, circulated such of his writings as were in their possession." (History of the Reformation in Italy, 2nd Ed., Chap. vi. pp. 425—427.)

On the 19th of August, 1556, Marianus Socinus, the father of Lælius, died at Bologna, in the seventy-fifth year of his age; and Lælius was desirous of proceeding to Venice, for the purpose of recovering his patrimony, which was withheld from him by the inquisitors, on the ground of his being the associate of heretics. To secure himself from personal risk, he sought a diplomatic appointment, and letters of safe conduct from Maximilian, King of Bohemia and Arch-duke of Austria, and from Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, to both of whom he was highly recommended by Melancthon, Bullinger, and Paul Scalichius, on account of his learning, piety, prudence and integrity, and his peculiar fitness for the office of an ambassador to an Italian court. In order to carry out this design, it seemed necessary for him, in the first place, to have a personal interview with both these Monarchs; but almost two years elapsed, before he set out on his journey for this purpose, for he had flattered himself with the hope, that his object would be accomplished without their assistance.

Bock conjectures, that Scalichius was not only an intimate friend of Lælius, but a secret emissary in diffusing his opinions through the dukedom of Prussia. (Hist. Socin. Pruss. § iv. p. 6.) Be this as it may, however, Lælius went to Vienna in the month of August, 1558; and afterwards into Poland. It is not exactly known what he did there; what particular places he visited by the way; or what effect the recommendatory letters of his friends had upon the minds of Maximilian, and Sigismund Augustus.

He seems, however, to have made no long stay at any place, but to have returned as quickly as possible to Zurich, and afterwards to have proceeded on his way into Italy; from which it has been inferred, that he obtained his object from those Princes, and was consequently able to prosecute his journey, without any further hindrance. But his attempts to recover the family property were unavailing, although great interest was made for him, through the medium of influential friends, both with the Doge of Venice, and the Grand Duke of Tuscany. When he arrived at his destination, he found that the different members of his family, all of whom lay under a suspicion of heresy, had fled into foreign countries. Celsus had been residing at Bologna, and Cornelius and Camillus with his nephew Faustus, the son of their eldest brother Alexander, at Sienna; but all were now dispersed in different directions. Faustus had taken refuge at Lyons, in France; Camillus had gone to the Grisons; Celsus had fled into Germany; and Cornelius, who had been arrested by the officers of the Inquisition, and thrown into prison, contrived to elude their vigilance, and make his escape into Switzerland.

Under these circumstances, Lælius returned without delay to Zurich, where he devoted himself, with renewed ardour, to his religious inquiries. He found it expedient, indeed, not to make an open profession of Antitrinitarian sentiments among the Swiss clergy, with whom he contrived to live upon friendly terms; but he opened his mind more freely to his friends at a distance, and particularly to his nephew Faustus. At length, however, in the very prime of life, at the early age of thirty-seven, just at a time when he had been prevailed upon by the entreaties of his friends, and had actually begun to circulate some of his writings, and when he was expecting to see some fruit

of his long and laborious theological studies, which others much older than himself lived to witness, he was suddenly removed by death, on the 14th of May, 1562, in the house of his friend, Pellican, at Zurich.

On hearing of his death, his nephew Faustus, who had been apprized of the event by Marius Besozzus, hastened from Lyons to Zurich; and took possession of his uncle's papers, of which he afterwards made considerable use, in the composition of his own works.

On all the leading points of Christian doctrine, the opinions of the nephew were those of the uncle. There were some subjects, indeed, on which Faustus had to decide for himself, and through the difficulties attendant upon which he had to work his own way. But he repeatedly acknowledged, that he was his uncle's disciple, and that the doctrines which he taught were chiefly derived from a study of his uncle's papers.

It now remains only to say a few words on the subject of Lælius's published writings.

1. Calvin, in a letter to Bullinger, dated Nov. 26th, 1553, says, "*Librum Serveti et Farraginem illam, quam petebas, civis quidam vester ad te tulit.*" The work here alluded to, under the designation "*Farrago illa,*" is supposed to be a collection of the opinions of Luther, Brennius and others, tending to shew, that the punishment of heretics forms no part of the duty of the Civil Magistrate; together with Basil Monfortius's refutation of the arguments usually alleged in favour of persecution. This collection is prefaced by some remarks, under the assumed name of Martin Bellius, in which the word *heretic* is explained, and in which it is also shewn, how the person so designated ought to be treated. It was first published in the year 1553, within a month after the martyrdom of Servetus; and seems to have borne the title, "*De Hæreti-*

cis, an sint persequendi, et omnino quomodo sit cum eis agendum, multorum, tum veterum, tum recentiorum Sententiæ," &c. But no copy of this edition has yet come to light. Mosheim, who examined several of the later editions, says that the word "Farrago" does not occur in the title of any of them; and Dr. M'Crie, who had access to an edition, purporting to have been printed at Magdeburg, in 1554, says that it "wants the words, 'Martini Bellii Farrago.'" But there does not seem to be any good reason for supposing, that the title of the first edition contained the word "Farrago," this being a term used by Calvin, to denote that it was a compilation, made up chiefly of extracts from the works of different writers. Many have attributed it to Castalio; but it has been thought highly improbable that he was the author, as the style is said to be different from that of Castalio, from whom the compiler expressly quotes. It is claimed as Lælius's by Bock (T. II. p. 639) and Illgen (Vit. L. Socini, p. 82); and both these writers assert this claim, on the alleged authority of Beza. But Mosheim and Schröck affirm, that Beza attributed it to Castalio (Illgen, *ubi supra*); and, what is not a little remarkable, these conflicting statements appear to have been both made on the strength of assertions, advanced by Beza in the same work, namely, his "Life of Calvin." The truth is, that Beza suspected it to be the joint production of Castalio and Lælius. In the only Life of Calvin by Beza to which the writer has access, and which is the one prefixed to Calvin's Correspondence, (Ed. Tert. Hanov. 1597,) it is expressly stated, under the year 1554, that Castalio was Martin Bellius. "Is ipse fuit Castello, quamvis id postea ejuravit." But in the very passage in which these words occur, he says, speaking of Castalio and Lælius jointly, "*opposuerunt isti (refutationi) farraginem partim ex scriptis piorum Doctorum depravatis,*

partim ex fanaticorum quorundam ignoti alioquin nominis schedis consarcinatum Martini cujusdam Bellii nomine, * * præfationi inscripto et eimentito Civitatis nomine, in qua editam fuisse hanc farraginem *mentiebantur*." In an earlier part of the same Life, however, under the year 1549, after alluding to the death of Lælius, Beza says, "*illum postea Bellianæ de qua suo loco dicemus farraginis maxima ex parte auctorem fuisse, * * compertum est.*" The opinion of Beza therefore was, as far as it can be collected from his own statements, that Castalio was Martin Bellius, notwithstanding his own affirmation to the contrary; but that Lælius Socinus was found, after his death, to have had a principal hand in the authorship of the work, published under that feigned name. Calvin himself, in a letter to Sultzzer, dated Aug. 7th, 1554, mentions Castalio and others, as the authors of "that little book full of atrocious calumnies." (Epist. 176, p. 329.) Perhaps we shall not be far from the truth, therefore, if we regard it as the joint production of Castalio and Lælius.

2. Faustus Socinus mentions a Paraphrase on the Proëm of John's Gospel, written by his uncle Lælius in the year 1561 (Fratr. Polon. T. II. p. 640); and Hoornbeek speaks of an "Explicatio in primum Caput Johannis," written by Lælius Socinus, and tells his readers, that Jerome Zanchius wrote a refutation of it. (Summa Controv. Lib. vii. p. 563.) But Sandius says, "I doubt whether Lælius Socinus wrote any Explication upon the first Chapter of John's Gospel, except this Paraphrase, which I have never yet been able to see." (Bibl. Ant. p. 21.) Many have thought, indeed, that Blandrata referred to such an Explication, and not to the above-mentioned Paraphrase, in a conference held at Weissenburg in 1568; but this opinion rests upon no proper foundation. (Illgen, Vit. L. Socini, p. 82.)

3. Sandius mentions, as another work of Lælius, one

bearing the title, “*Rhapsodia in Esaiam Prophetam* ;” and says that it is quoted by the compiler of “*A Collection of Passages concerning the Trinity*.” (B. A. p. 21.) This work of Lælius is mentioned in the following terms, by George Schomann, under the year 1566. “About this time, certain brethren learnt, from the *Rhapsodies* of Lælius Socinus, that the Son of God is not the second person of the Trinity, coëssential and coëqual with the Father, but the man Jesus Christ, conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified and raised again from the dead : and we were induced by them to examine the Sacred Writings.” (G. Schomanni Testam. ad calcem Sandii B. A. p. 194.)

4, 5. Sandius further mentions “*A Dissertation on the Sacraments, addressed to the Inhabitants of Zurich and Geneva, in the year 1560* ;” and a treatise “*On the Resurrection of the Body*.” (B. A. pp. 20, 21.) These appear to have been first published in a collection of tracts, bearing the following title. “*Fausti et Lælii Socini, item Ernesti Soneri, Tractatus aliquot Theologici, nunquam antehac in lucem editi. Eleutheropoli, Typis Godofr. Philadelphi, 1654*.” (16mo. pp. 100.) In this collection, the two treatises of Lælius above mentioned occupied the third and fourth places respectively, and extended over about a fifth part of the volume (pp. 15—35). The latter of the two was printed from a copy made by Curcellæus, who transcribed it from Lælius’s autograph. (Vogt, Catal. p. 635.)

Illgen is of opinion that the following works have been erroneously ascribed to Lælius. 1. “*Contra Libellum Calvini, in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos Jure Gladii coërcendos esse: per Dialogos inter Calvinum et Vaticanum, 1554*,” 8vo. 2. “*In Hæreticis coërcendis quatenus progredi liceat, Mini Celsi Senensis Disputatio: ubi nomi-*

natim eos ultimo Supplicio affici non debere, aperte demonstratur. Christlingæ, 1577," 8vo. 3. "Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius de Hæreticis Gladio coërcendis." 4. "Præcipuarum Enumeratio Caussarum, cur Christiani, cum in multis Religionis Doctrinis mobiles sint et varii, in Trinitatis tamen retinendo Dogmate sint constantissimi." 5. "Articuli Fidei." 6. "Theses de Deo trino et uno, al. de Trinitate." 7. "Voces ambiguæ in Sacra Scriptura." On each of these it will be necessary to make a few remarks, before the present article is brought to a close.

1. "Contra Libellum Calvinii," &c. The first edition of this rare little volume was printed in 1554. It was reprinted in Holland, with additions relating to the history of Servetus, and extracts from the writings of Calvin and others. But there has been great difficulty in ascertaining the date of this latter edition, owing to the manner in which it is given on the title-page, which is as follows, M.D.I.C.XII. The point between the I and the C runs into the former of these letters, so as to give it something like the appearance of an L; and it has accordingly been mistaken for an L by a writer in the "Monthly Repository," who represents the date as being printed MDLCXII. (R. S., apud Mon. Rep. 1819, p. 741.) But there seems to be little reason to doubt, that it is a typographical error, the printer having, through mistake, substituted the type of an I followed by a period, for one of the spaces sometimes used by printers, to display the letters in a title-page. Sandius supposes the date to have been intended for 1612; and as he makes no allusion to the above peculiarity, it is possible that the error may have been corrected in the copy which he consulted. R. S., the correspondent of the Monthly Repository above alluded to, on the supposition that the date is expressed by the letters MDLCXII, asks, "but may not this be read 1562?" This, however, is

rendered impossible by the fact, that the date assigned to the “Disputatio de Homicidio,” (sign. N. ii.,) is M.DC.II. (1602). Vogt thought that 1662 was the date intended in the title-page; but from what has been said above, and from the manner of printing the date just mentioned, it is morally certain that 1612 is the proper date of the Dutch edition.

R. S. states, that “this work is referred to by Mosheim, in his Life of Servetus, under the following title: ‘Dissertatio, qua disputatur quo Jure quove Fructu Hæretici sunt coërcendi Gladio vel Igne, vel Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum.’” The reason of its being so referred to, the present writer is fortunately enabled to explain, by having in his possession two copies of the reprint of 1612, which was in fact an *editio biceps*. Both these copies are word for word the same in the body of the book, even to the very errata, an instance of which occurs as early as the third line of the first page, where we read “Proptetera,” instead of *Propterea*. The title-page, and the Address to the Reader, together with a blank leaf at the beginning of the book, occupy just one sheet, or 16 pages in each copy. The Address to the Reader, though substantially the same in both, slightly varies as regards the form; and the title-pages, one of which has, and the other has not a date, are altogether distinct from each other. In the former of these, the title is, “Contra Libellum Calvinii in quo ostendere conatur Hæreticos Jure Gladii coërcendos esse,” &c.; in the latter, “Dissertatio, qua disputatur, quo Jure, quove Fructu Hæretici sunt coërcendi Gladio vel Igne,” &c. In neither are the words “vel Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum” added; and though this is a description, by which the work has long been currently known, owing to the circumstance of the opinions in favour of coërcion having the name of *Calvin* prefixed to them, and the replies of the author

being headed by the word *Vaticanus*, it forms no part of the title itself.

In the Address to the Reader, prefixed to the Dutch edition, this work is expressly ascribed to Castalio. Sandius notices this fact; but yet, with Cloppenburg and Hoornbeek, regards Lælius Socinus as the author. (B. A. p. 20.) Bock thinks that it was written neither by Castalio nor Lælius (H. A. Tom. II. p. 639); but the probability is, that, like the treatise “*De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi*,” &c., published under the name of Martin Bellius, it was the joint production of both. It contains an allusion to that work in the following terms. “A book has been printed, entitled, ‘*De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi*,’ in which very many authors are cited, all of whom you (Calvin) condemn. For Augustin, Jerome, Hilary, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Pellican, Luther, Brentius, Otto Brunfeld, Urbanus Regius, Cœlius Secundus, S. Castalio, George Renberg, John Calvin himself, and many others, are there cited, all of whom make against Calvin; all of whom, tied up in one faggot, Calvin has now cast, together with himself, into the ashes of Servetus.” (Respons. 22.) The reason alleged for doubting, whether Castalio participated in the authorship of the so-called “*Dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus*,” is, that he is mentioned, (Resp. 74,) as having formerly mixed sacred with profane things, when speaking of Moses, in the Preface to his Latin translation of the Pentateuch. The terms in which this is done would certainly not have been deemed respectful, or complimentary, if they had proceeded from any other pen than his own; but they were probably used, for the purpose of lulling the suspicions of those, who might otherwise have imagined him to be the author of the Dialogue. It is enough for our present purpose, (and thus much is admitted by Bock himself,) that the general sentiments of the work,

as respects the punishment of heretics by death, and particularly as regards the burning of Servetus, are those of Castalio. Nor is it by any means incredible, on the supposition that Lælius Socinus was secretly associated with Castalio, in the composition of this work, that he penned such a passage as the following respecting himself. "One Lælius Zosinus sent a letter to his friend at Geneva, in which he wrote, that the blood of Abel cried unto God, and that it would happen, that Cain," (an evident play upon the name *Calvin*,) "would find no peace on earth." (Resp. 8.) Lælius's surname may have been written "Zosinus" as a blind, or may have been a misprint for *Sozinus*, which, as we have already seen, was the orthography adopted by himself, when he entered his name on the list of students at Wittenberg.

2. "In Hæreticis coërcendis," &c. This admirable work, though attributed, like the preceding one, to Castalio and Lælius Socinus, was written by Minus Celsus,* one of the early Italian Protestants. The author frequently quotes the "*Satanæ Stratagemata*" of Acontius; and as that work was not published till the year 1565, three years after the death of Lælius, and between one and two after that of Castalio, the conjectures of those, who attribute it to either of these writers, are wholly without foundation.

3. "Martini Bellii Dialogus Lælius," &c. No work with this title ever existed; although Bayle tells us, that some have attributed a Dialogue so inscribed to Lælius Socinus. Placcius, referring to the Life of Calvin, where Beza professes that he himself refuted such a work, has confounded it with the compilation before mentioned, as having been written under the feigned name of Martin Bellius; and Hoornbeek has also confounded it with the

* APPENDIX, No. iv.

“Dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus.” (Vide Illgen, Vit. L. Soc. pp. 78, 79.)

4. *Præcipuarum Enumeratio Caussarum*,” &c. This treatise is inserted in the works of Francis Junius, (T. II. p. 1, sqq.,) who composed a reply to it. Sandius mentions it in his list of Faustus Socinus’s writings, (B. A. p. 78,) and says that some have ascribed it to him; but that it was probably the work of his uncle Lælius, because the style seems to be different from that of Faustus. Bock, on the authority of Christopher Pelargus, attributes it to Christian Francken. (Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 364; T. II. p. 651. Vide *Art.* 111, No. 7.)

5, 6, 7. “*Articuli Fidei*,” “*Theses de Deo*,” &c.; and “*Voces ambiguæ*,” &c. Of these three treatises Sandius says, that they were published by those Italians, who established the societies in the Venetian territory, of which he had previously spoken. (B. A. p. 25.) Not being able, however, to trace them to their proper authors, he mentions them, by way of supplement, to the Catalogue of Lælius Socinus’s writings, on account of the share, which Lælius is supposed to have taken in the formation of those societies. No remark is made upon No. 5, either by Sandius or Illgen; but Bock seems to think, that it was the same as Lælius’s “Confession concerning God,” dated July 15th, 1555, and inserted in Hottinger’s “Hist. Eccles.,” T. IX. P. v. C. iii. (Bock, Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 652.) It is not improbable that Nicholas Paruta was the author of No. 6, entitled, “Theses concerning the Triune God, otherwise called the Trinity.” (Vide *Art.* 19.) No. 7, as we learn from Budzinius, treated upon such words as *Beginning*, *World*, *God*, *All things*; the verbs *To create*, and *To make*, &c. Sandius does not hesitate to declare his conviction, that this was the production of Blandrata; and that it was identical with the “*Voces ambiguæ*” subjoined

to a book published by the Ministers of Poland and Transylvania.

VIDEND. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. SOCINI (Lelie). *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. SOCIN (MARIANUS), Note B. *Illgen*, Symbolarum ad Vitam et Doctrinam Lælii Socini illustrandam, P. i. ii. 4to. Lips. *Illgen*, Vita Lælii Socini Specimen Historico-Ecclesiasticum. Lips. 1814, 8vo. *Trechsel*, Lelio Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit. Heidelb. 1844, 8vo. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 18—25. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. C. iii. § i—iv. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt. T. I. L. ii. C. iv. pp. 86, 87. 137; C. v. p. 145. *Calvini* Epistolæ, N. 103. 104. 359. Epistolæ Illustr. Clariss. Virorum, pp. 135. 236. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. i. *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. (ad Calc. Sandii B. A.) p. 210. *Zeltner*, Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. p. 321, Not. b, p. 349. *Mosh.* Inst. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § i. *Hoornbeek*, Summa Controv. L. vii. pp. 563, 564. *Cloppenburgi* Theol. Opera, T. II. pp. 325—327, etc.

14.

CAMILLUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) was a brother of Lælius Socinus. Having embraced the principles of the Reformation, and carried his views much further than some of the leading reformers of the day, he left his native country, and went into Switzerland, where he joined the other Italian refugees. By De Porta he is called *Camillus Sozinus*, in his History of the Reformed Religion among the Grisons. Very different views have been formed of his character by friends and enemies. The latter have represented him as artful in his conduct, and absurd in his opinions; while the former have praised him, as an upright and pious man, and an enemy only to pharisaism, or hypocritical pretension. He is mentioned in connexion with a Synod, held in the month of June, 1571, at Coire, the capital of the canton of the Grisons; on which occasion a sharp debate took place, concerning the punishment of heretics. An account of this debate was transmitted, in a letter to Henry Bullinger, by Tobias Eglin (or *Iconius*, as he calls himself); which Schelhorn copied from the public

registry at Zurich, and inserted in his "Dissertation concerning Minus Celsus." It appears, that Camillus Socinus, who, with some others, took the liberal side of the question, at the above-mentioned Synod, was privately disowned, after which he found it expedient to leave Switzerland; but of his subsequent history little, or nothing has been preserved.

It is placed beyond a doubt, that he was an Antitrinitarian; and Cornelius and Celsus, two other brothers of Lælius, are said to have embraced the same sentiments.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 554. 576. 624. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt. T. I. L. ii. p. 544. *Schellhornii* Diss. Epist. de Mino Celso Senensi, pp. 37—56. *R. S.* apud Mon. Rep. Vol. I. (N. S.) pp. 571, 572, and Ref.

15.

CORNELIUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) as we learn from Przypcovius, lived at Sienna, with his brother Camillus, and his nephew Faustus. After that city had fallen under the dominion of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the government was alarmed by reports of the spread of heresy; and in 1560, the Bishop of Bologna was sent thither, to conduct a process against Cornelius, who was charged with having imbibed Antitrinitarian opinions. He underwent a strict examination; but could not be prevailed upon to make any other confession, than that he believed all which was contained in the Scriptures. With the consent of the Duke he was transferred to Rome. At this time the whole family of the Socini was in great danger. Some appear to have made a recantation of the liberal opinions, which they are known to have professed; while others sought safety in flight. Cornelius was fortunate enough to escape from prison, and succeeded in joining his brothers in Switzerland.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 577. 624. *McCræ's* Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Chap. v. pp. 295, 296. *R. S.* apud Mon. Rep. Vol. I. (N. S.) p. 572.

16.

CELSUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) another brother of Lælius, settled first at Sienna, as Professor Extraordinary of Civil Law; and afterwards removed to Bologna, where, through his father's interest, he enjoyed a salary, as Professor of Canon Law. On the death of his father, in 1556, Celsus succeeded him in his Professorship at the Academy of Macerata; but was soon obliged to leave Italy, on account of a change in his religious sentiments. Bock appears to doubt whether he embraced the opinions of his brother Lælius; but admits that he may have done this, without publicly professing them, because Lælius himself never made an open avowal of Antitrinitarianism. Judging from the little that is known of Celsus, his great failing seems to have been a want of perseverance. Hubert Languet, writing to a friend, at the close of the year 1559, says, that Celsus had then formed an engagement with the University of Jena; but anticipates that, if he should go thither, his stay would be short. It is not improbable that he threw up the appointment; for his name does not appear in Adrian Beier's "Syllabus of the Rectors and Professors at Jena."

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 576, 577. *R. S.* apud Mon. Rep. Vol. I. (N. S.) p. 571.

17.

LEONARDO BUCALI, or BUSALIS, a Calabrian Abbot, of Spanish descent, has been reckoned among the followers of Servetus, and is mentioned by Lubieniecus, as a member of the celebrated society at Vicenza. When this society was dispersed, he sought among the Turks that safety, which was denied him in a professedly Christian

land; and having found his way to Damascus, supported himself by following the trade of a tailor, and ended his life there.

There was another Leonardo, a Court Preacher at Cra-cow, who was removed from his office on account of his religion: but whether he was the same person as the Leonardo Bucali, who forms the subject of the present article, seems doubtful.

Bock also mentions another Leonardo, who became known to him, in the course of his inquiries concerning the society at Vicenza, and who bore the surname of *Pomarus*. It appears that he was a Spaniard; and perhaps he ought to be reckoned among the friends, or patrons of Servetus.

VIDEND. *Lubienicci* Hist. Ref. Pol. L. ii. C. i. p. 39. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 416, 424, 425. *Illgen*, *Symbolæ ad Vit. et Doctrin.* L. Socini illustr. Partic. i. pp. 68, 69.

18.

MATTHEW GRIBALDUS, (*Ital.* MATTEO GRIBALDO,) surnamed MOFA, and sometimes called CHERIANUS or CHERIENSIS, from Quiers, in Piedmont, the place of his nativity, was a learned Civilian of Padua. He taught in several Schools and Colleges of Italy and France; as Pisa, Perugia, Toulouse and Valence. Melanchthon intimates, that he was dismissed by the Senate of Venice, on account of a leaning towards Protestantism; and Pancirollus says, that he was the colleague of Torrielli, author of “Commentaries on the Pandects,” and being suspected of heresy, was under the necessity of quitting Padua. On renouncing Catholicism he joined the Calvinistic party; but his views respecting the Trinity caused him to be numbered among the Unitarians, or New Arians.

He was present, in 1548, at the death of Francis Spira,

of which tragical event he wrote an account, at the close of that year; and *Coelius Secundus Curio*, in a Preface to that account, speaks of *Gribaldus* in the highest terms, as a learned Civilian, and profound Lawyer.

On leaving Italy, *Gribaldus* went into France, and delivered lectures on the Civil Law for some time at *Toulouse*. He was at *Geneva* in 1553, a year which is memorable, in the annals of that city, for the martyrdom of *Servetus*. On that occasion he sought an interview with *Calvin*, which was at first declined, but afterwards granted, on condition that whatever might be said should be uttered in the presence of *Calvin's* colleagues, and three Elders. To this stipulation *Gribaldus* assented, but the conference was suddenly broken off, for the reason about to be assigned. When *Gribaldus* went to the place appointed, *Calvin* refused to extend to him the hand of Christian fellowship, unless he would first make it appear, that he and all present were agreed in their opinions respecting the Trinity, and the Deity of *Jesus Christ*. *Gribaldus*, not prepared for such a reception, abruptly quitted the room. He was then summoned to appear before the Magistrates, and required to give an account of his faith; but nothing was elicited from him, by which he could be made to criminate himself. Shortly afterwards, however, some expressions escaped him, from which it was inferred, that he was tainted with heresy. On being interrogated by *Calvin*, he said, that it was contrary to the acknowledged rules of equity, that he should be molested, because his faith happened to differ from that of the Church of *Geneva*. This objection was overruled: but it was ultimately determined by the Senate, that, as he was a foreigner, he should not be pressed any further, *Calvin*, in the mean time, undertaking to keep a strict watch over his conduct, during the remainder of his residence at *Geneva*.

Under these circumstances, Gribaldus deemed it most prudent to take his departure, and repaired to Tübingen, where he was appointed to the chair of Civil Law. His lectures drew together crowded audiences; but his heresy being detected by the vigilance of Jerome Gerhard, a brother Civilian, who was employed by the Duke of Wirtemberg as a spy upon his conduct, he found it necessary again to consult his safety by flight. This was in 1556; and on the 6th of June, in the year following, legal proceedings were commenced against him at Tübingen by James Andrea.

In the year 1558, we find him at Fargias, a village on the confines of the Genevese territory, in the prefecture of Gex, where he possessed an estate, and granted a temporary asylum to J. Valentine Gentilis. For this act of humanity, combined with other circumstances, involving him in a suspicion of heresy, he was imprisoned at Bern; but being terrified by the fear of punishment, he consented to subscribe the orthodox Confession of Faith, and thus regained his liberty.

In 1559 or 1560, he was giving lectures at Grenoble, on subjects connected with the legal profession. But his stay there was of short duration; for persecution on account of his religious opinions drove him from that place, as it had before driven him from Tübingen.

The precise time of his death has not been ascertained; but Bayle places it in the month of September, 1564. His death saved him from the severity of an ecclesiastical tribunal, which was ready to pronounce sentence against him, on account of his religious opinions. He was carried off by an infectious disease, the malignity of which was such, that he was abandoned by every one; and it was with difficulty that any person could be found, to commit his remains to the grave.

The author of the “Dialogue between Calvin and Vaticanus” (Resp. 8) is supposed to allude to Gribaldus, as a certain Jurist, (“quidam *Ictus*,” an abbreviation for *Jurisconsultus*,) who said of Servetus’s opinion, that Jesus Christ, as regarded his humanity, was the true and natural Son of God, born of God and the Virgin,—“Such an opinion is not very offensive to me; and, what is more, I have always thought so myself, even from a boy.” He is said to have held, that the Divine Nature was divided into three Eternal Spirits, distinguished from each other, not only by number, but also by subordination; so that the deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, together with that of other celestial natures, was referred to the Father alone, who was underrived, and God of himself, as the sole fountain and head of Divinity.

Beza says, in allusion to certain eminent Antitrinitarians, who were the associates, and fellow-labourers of Gribaldus, in the cause which he had espoused,—“fuit quoque in hac cohorte pene veteranus, Gribaldus Jurisconsultus.”

Gribaldus was the author of many valuable legal works, the titles of which are given by Sandius and Bayle, but which it is unnecessary to specify in this place. Sandius also refers to a writing, containing an outline of his religious opinions. The Rev. S. R. Maitland, in his “Index of English Books in the Archiëpiscopal Library at Lambeth,” mentions, under the name *Matthew Gribalde*, (p. 50,) “An Epistle concerning the terrible Judgments of God,” &c., which is probably an English translation of Gribaldus’s Account of the death of Francis Spira.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 17, 18. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art. GRIBAUD. Boek*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 456—465. *Trechsel*, *Lelio Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit*, 5ter Abschnitt. S. 277—302. *Melch. Adam*. Vitæ Germ. Theolog. p. 183. Vitæ Germ. Jureconsult. et Politic. p. 94. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. *Art. GRIBAUD. Moshemii* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § vi. et Ref. *Lubienicci* Hist.

Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. v. p. 108. *Calvini* Epist. N. 238, p. 440. Contra Libellum Calvini, etc. Resp. 8.

19.

NICHOLAS PARUTA was a member of the society of Vicenza. His family was much celebrated for its patriotic deeds in the republic of Lucca. Paul Paruta, about the year 1317, left that republic, and went to Venice, on account of the war between the Emperor and the Pope. He had three sons, Ambrose, John and Bartholomew. The last of these had seven sons, some of whom attained to high distinction in literature. There was a Nicholas Paruta, of patrician rank, in the republic of Venice, who was celebrated as a diplomatist: but he was a different person from the subject of the present article, of whose history little is known, beyond the simple facts, that, when he left Italy, he went first to Switzerland, and then to Poland, and finally settled in Moravia. All the writers, who mention his name, intimate that he dwelt some years in Moravia: but he seems to have led a retired life, and to have been less active in the dissemination of his religious opinions, than most of his Antitrinitarian contemporaries.

His exact sentiments are unknown: but he is thought to have held opinions, similar to those, for which Servetus suffered at Geneva. Some "Theses concerning the Triune God" have been attributed to him, which others have claimed for Lælius Socinus. They are supposed to have been the same with those, which were published at the end of Blandrata's "Brief Account of a Disputation held at Weissenburg, March 8th, 1568." (Vide *Art.* 38, No. 15.)

In 1574, Paruta addressed a letter to Stanislaus Lutomirscius, Superintendent of the Churches of Little Poland, in which he treated of the rite of Baptism, and contended that those who were admitted into the Church should be baptized, for the sake of avoiding any evil consequences,

which might arise from the omission of the ceremony, and without any reference to the question, whether re-baptism is necessary to salvation.

Rabbi Isaac Ben Abraham, in "Chissuk Emuna," (p. 119,) and several Christian writers, mention a treatise by Paruta, entitled, "Sober and orthodox Disputations concerning the One true God, Jehovah." This book, which is not mentioned by Sandius, was printed by John Cartzanski at Losk, in Lithuania, A.D. 1578.⁶⁶

VIDEND. *Sandii* B.A. pp. 25, 26, 29. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 588, 589; T. II. pp. 481, 482. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Pol. L. ii. C. i. p. 40. *Wolffi* Bibl. Hebr. T. I. p. 642.

20.

JOHN VALENTINE GENTILIS, (*Ital.* GENTILE,) the son of Francis Gentilis, was a native of Cosenza, in the kingdom of Naples, and suffered death at Bern, on account of his religious sentiments; "his only error" being, in the words of Mosheim, "that he considered the Son and Holy Spirit as subordinate to the Father."

Budzinius says, that the opinion, which Gentilis delivered in at the Synod of Pinczow, Nov. 4th, 1562, was, "that God created, in the breadth of eternity, a most excellent Spirit, which afterwards, in the fulness of time, became incarnate." This was substantially the opinion of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, particularly of Justin and Lactantius; and was the basis, upon which Arius afterwards erected his system. It appears, indeed, that Gentilis was more of an Arian than anything else; for though he has been called a Tritheist, he essentially differed from Dr. Sherlock and others, who held three Infinite Spirits, perfectly equal, whereas he maintained the priority and supremacy of the Father. Bayle acquits Gentilis of the charge of Tritheism; but says, that he held different opinions at different times.

Lubieniecius, in his "History of the Polish Reformation," (p. 107,) says, in allusion to him, "I remember having read that it was his opinion, that God had the power of generating what he wished; and therefore generated the Logos before the ages, and propagated the Spirit."

Benedict Aretins extracted from the writings of Gentilis the following propositions. 1. The Trinity is a mere human invention, unknown to the Catholic Creeds, and diametrically opposed to evangelical truth. 2. The Father alone is that God, who in Scripture is called the One, and the Only God. 3. The Son is not of himself, but of the Father, to whom, as deriving his essence from him, he is subordinate. 4. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are distinct, not only as regards their persons, but their essence. 5. The Son was begotten of the Father, according to his essence, as a subordinate Spirit, different from the Father. 6. There are three Eternal Spirits, each of whom is a god of himself. 7. These three Spirits are distinct in order, degree, and essential properties.

Gentilis was far advanced in life, when he found it expedient to quit Naples, on account of holding heretical opinions. He joined Blandrata, Gribaldus, Aleiati, and other Italian refugees, who had renounced the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and formed themselves into a separate Church at Geneva. When their opinions became known to the public authorities in that city, they were cited to appear before the Senators, Ministers and Elders, and required to subscribe to the orthodox faith. But Gentilis, undaunted by the threats which were held out against him, still continued to disseminate his sentiments. He disregarded the vigilance of the great Genevese Reformer, and paid the penalty.

In the middle of July, 1558, a charge of heresy was brought against him, and he was thrown into prison, at the

instigation of Calvin. His incarceration taught him, that he was in greater danger than he had apprehended; and in order to avert this danger, he drew up various Confessions, which were presented to the Senate. But he first of all addressed a letter to the Ministers of the Church of Geneva, in which, besides setting forth his own opinion, and appealing to the testimony of Irenæus and Tertullian, in confirmation of its truth, he complained that the mind of Calvin had been incensed against him, and entreated that they would endeavour to remove his prejudices, and soften his animosity.

On being questioned before the tribunal, he made a voluntary acknowledgment, that, a little while after he had subscribed the Genevese Confession, he returned to his former opinions, and did all in his power to disseminate them. The Ministers, or rather Calvin in their name, prepared a document, purporting to contain a refutation of the opinions advanced by Gentilis in his letter to them, and giving to the passages, which he had quoted from Irenæus and Tertullian, a more orthodox interpretation than he had done. This answer did not satisfy him, and he continued to assert the truth of his own opinion. But when he found, that, by pursuing this course, he should only exasperate his Judges, and probably bring down upon himself the same punishment which had overtaken Servetus, his courage failed, and he had recourse to entreaties and supplications. Copies of two Letters, or Apologies, which he addressed to the Magistrates, are still in existence, from which it appears, that Calvin was actuated by the same fiery zeal against Gentilis, as he had before shewn against Servetus, and that nothing would satisfy him short of the life of his victim: and it is further evident, from the same documents, that it was not from conviction, but through fear, inspired by the death of Servetus, that Gentilis was

induced to recant. This is rendered still more evident by his relapse, after he had escaped from the clutches of Calvin.

The Magistrates and Ministers of Geneva, not content with the two Apologies above mentioned, insisted upon having from Gentilis's own hand a solemn recantation of his errors; and an expression of his regret, that he had offended the Church by his heretical impiety. This they obtained, in the shape of a letter, and a formal abjuration of his opinions, written with his own hand, and addressed to the Senate of Geneva. His Recantation, which has been preserved, was as follows.

“I confess that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are One God; that is, three distinct persons in one essence. The Father is not the Son, nor is the Son the Holy Spirit; but each of these persons is that entire essence. In like manner, the Son and Holy Spirit, as regards the Divine Nature, are one God, coëqual and coëternal with the Father. This is what I think, and profess with the heart as well as the mouth; and I trust, through the grace of God, that I shall live and die in this confession. But all heresies contrary to this most holy truth I condemn and detest; and especially those blasphemies, which I have written with my own hand, in which, among other errors, I asserted a quaternity, and made Christ the Son of the One God of Israel, so as to rob him of his Eternal Divinity. Lastly, since many very erroneous consequences arise from these premises, I condemn and execrate them all, and openly profess, that I assent in all and everything to the doctrine of this Holy Church, and especially and expressly in this most sacred article of the Trinity; in which I acknowledge, that I have so grievously and blasphemously sinned, that I would sooner die, than repeat so great a crime. This is what I think with my heart; and I pray

the infinite mercy of God, that He may hereafter impress upon me such a sense of these things, that the fruits of my true penitence may be in some measure known to all men. —Aug. 29th, 1558.”

The original of this Recantation the Ministers of Geneva afterwards sent to Prince Nicholas Radzivil, Palatine of Wilna, in order to put him upon his guard against Gentilis, who had fled from Geneva, and was disseminating his opinions on the confines of Poland. Meantime, however, the Recantation having been made, he was sentenced to be stripped close to his shirt, and walk barefoot and bare-headed, with a lighted torch in his hand; then to beg God’s pardon, and that of the Court, on his bended knees, for having maliciously and wickedly spread abroad a false and heretical doctrine. After this, he was to declare, that he detested and abhorred from his heart those abominable, lying and blasphemous writings, which he had composed in its defence; and to cast them, with his own hands, into the flames, there to be burnt to ashes. To complete his degradation, he was, last of all, to be led through the principal streets of Geneva, in a penitential habit, at the sound of a trumpet; and was strictly commanded not to leave the city without permission.

It was scarcely to be expected, after his forced Recantation, that he should comply with the last part of this cruel sentence; and remain in a place, in which he had been compelled to submit to such indignities, and was still in imminent danger of his life. Accordingly, he embraced the first favourable opportunity for effecting his escape. But being poor, he was unable to do this without pecuniary aid; and was indebted for his freedom to the liberality of his friend Alciati, whom, according to Budzinius, they durst not attack in the same way, because he was rich, and of a noble family. For some time he led a wandering life

in Savoy, France and Germany; and was actively employed in making converts to his opinions, which led, on more occasions than one, to his apprehension and imprisonment.

At length, about the year 1561, he either accompanied his friend Alciati into Poland, or joined him there: but the Genevese clergy did all in their power to prejudice the minds of the authorities of that country against him. A Letter, addressed by them to Prince Nicholas Radzivil, was printed, by way of Appendix to a Polish work of Christopher Threcius, "On the Doctrine of the Unity of the inseparable God, against the blasphemous Errors of the New Arians of the present Day," A.D. 1566. To this was subjoined the written Recantation of Gentilis, signed, as was stated, with his own hand, and confirmed on oath; "by which," it was added, "he became reconciled, for a time, to the Church of Geneva, in all things, but especially in the article concerning the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity."

Calvin, who, a few years before, had been actively instrumental in procuring the condemnation of Servetus, was incensed beyond measure, that a second victim had escaped him; and, in a letter dated the 26th of October, 1561, (the anniversary of Servetus's condemnation,) and addressed to a distinguished Pole, he vented his rage in the following not very dignified language. "Valentine Gentilis, whose ravings I have briefly refuted, was of the same faction with Blandrata; and so like him, that there was nothing to choose between them. That his frauds have not been detected in Poland, and that it has not yet been discovered how insidious and deceitful he is, might perhaps be borne: but I am greatly surprised, that a man, who has no other recommendation than his own conceit and impudence, should have acquired so much influence among you, as,

like another Atlas, to carry the Church on his shoulders. Assuredly, if I did not blush for such inconsiderate credulity, I should not love your nation. But you will learn to satiety, nay even to loathing, what kind of man, or beast, or monster he is, from a common letter, which I am writing to the Churches."

A few years after this, Gentilis, having first visited Moravia and Austria, went, in the year 1566, to Gex, a prefecture of the Canton of Bern, where he was again taken; and his person being demanded by the authorities of the city of Bern, he was delivered up to them. Several attempts were made, between the 5th of August and the 9th of September, in that year, to wring from him another Recantation; but they proved ineffectual. He was, therefore, condemned to be beheaded; and the following was the sentence pronounced against him.—“Whereas, Valentine Gentilis, a native of Cosenza, in the kingdom of Naples, after eight years' preparation to attack the doctrine of the Trinity, began openly to teach, that there are in the Trinity three distinct Spirits, differing from each other in numerical essence, among which (three Spirits) he acknowledges the Father only to be that infinite God whom we ought to worship, which is manifest blasphemy against the Son; and besides this, has broached several other dangerous errors, for which he was apprehended by the Magistrates of Geneva, and being fully convicted by them, made his Recantation there, and publicly abjured these his wicked opinions; and bound himself by an oath not to depart out of that city without leave of the Senate, yet violated the sacred obligation of his oath, by stealing away from thence, and by relapsing into the same erroneous opinions which he had abjured, and reassuming their defence with greater heat and earnestness, by disputing and writing books, in opposition to the plain and express testimony of Scripture;

and hath been guilty of the vilest scurrility, and most horrid blasphemies against the Son of God, and the glorious mystery of the Trinity: and lastly, since his being made prisoner to this Honourable Senate, hath notwithstanding that full and sufficient instruction which hath been given him, still continued obstinate in his perverse and heretical opinions: This Honourable Senate, to prevent disturbances, and to root out such pestilent errors, have adjudged him to be beheaded.”—As he was led out to execution, and just before he laid down his head upon the block, he said, “Many have suffered for the glory of the Son; but none, as far as I know, have died for the glory and superiority of the Father.”

The year after the death of Gentilis, Beza published a short account of him, bearing the following title. “*Valentini Gentilis, teterrimi Hæretici Impietatum et triplicis Perfidie et Perjurii brevis Explicatio, ex Aetis publicis Senatûs Genevensis, optimâ Fide descripta: Genevæ, ex Officinâ Franc. Perrini: 1567.*” In the same year appeared another account of him by Benedict Aretius, a Divine of the Protestant Reformed Church of Bern, entitled, “*Valentini Gentilis justo Capitis Supplicio Bernæ adfecti brevis Historia, et contra ejusdem Blasphemias orthodoxa Defensio Articuli de S. Trinitate, &c. Auctore D. Bened. Aretio, Bernensis Ecclesiæ Doctore Theologo: Genevæ, ex Officinâ Franc. Perrini: 1567.*” To the latter of these two works is prefixed a Dedication “to the Most Honourable and Noble Lords, Nicolas à Diessbach, Nicolas à Grafenried, and Petermann ab Erlach, most worthy Senators of the Republic of Bern,” &c. A translation of this work into English was published in the year 1696, towards the close of the controversy between Sherlock and South, and has been attributed to the pen of the latter. This translation bears the following title. “A short History of

Valentinus Gentilis the Tritheist, tried, condemned, and put to Death by the Protestant Reformed City and Church of Bern in Switzerland, for asserting the Three Divine Persons of the Trinity to be [*Three Distinct, Eternal Spirits, &c.*]. Wrote in Latin, by Benedict Aretius, a Divine of that Church, and now translated into English for the use of Dr. Sherlock: humbly tendered to the Consideration of the Arch-bishops and Bishops of this Church and Kingdom. London, printed, and sold by E. Whitlock, near Stationers' Hall, 1696," 12mo. The work itself is divided into twenty Chapters, and extends from p. 17 to p. 134. The last Chapter closes with a brief account of Gentilis's trial, condemnation and death.

Besides the Confessions which he wrote during his imprisonment at Geneva, and some manuscript verses on the Trinity, Sandius attributes to him the following.

1. A Book written with his own hand, and dedicated to the King of Poland. In this book he inserted the above Confessions.

2. Antidotes to the reply of the Genevese Clergy.

3. A Refutation of the 13th Chapter of the First Book of "Calvin's Institutions," in which he wholly condemns the doctrine of the Trinity, as received by all Christian Churches down to his own time.

4. Protheses from Augustin's 15 Books on the Trinity.

5. Extracts from the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Koran, in defence of his own Opinion.

6. Annotations on Athanasius.

Sandius observes, that the "Protheses from Augustin" appear to have been those, which were printed in the work of the Ministers of Poland and Transylvania, "On a false and true Knowledge of God." (Bk. ii. Ch. vi.) He also mentions, as having been found among the papers of Gentilis, a manuscript treatise, in Italian and Latin, On the

Incarnation of Christ; but professes his inability to decide, whether it was written by Gentilis or not.

VIDEND. Val. Gentilis Impietatum et Perjurii Brevis Explanatio. Genev. 1567. Val. Gentilis Brevis Hist. Auctore *D. Bened. Aretio*. Genev. 1567. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* GENTILIS. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 26, 27. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 369—371. 1079; T. II. C. ii. § xi. pp. 427—455. *Trechsel*, Lelio Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit. 5ter und 6ter Abschnitt. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Pol. L. ii. C. v. pp. 107, 108. *Moshem*. Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § vi. et. Ref. *Calvini* Epist. N. 319, p. 599. Mon. Rep. Vol. III. (1808) pp. 309—312. *Cloppenb.* Theol. Opera, T. II. pp. 326, 327. *Melch. Adam*. Vitæ Exter. Theol. pp. 47, 48. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. *Art.* (Jean Valentin) GENTILIS.

21.

JOHN PAUL ALCIATI, a Milanese of noble family, and a soldier, was one of that society of Italians, who, among other plans for reforming the Church, sought to bring about a reformation in some of those doctrines, which are received by the majority of Protestants, and at the head of which stands that of the Trinity.

The reputation of many persons bearing the name of Alciati has been celebrated by historical writers; and among the number, Andrew, who published a Book of “Emblems,” which he dedicated to Conrad Peutinger, Secretary to the Senate of Augsburg, and discoverer of a celebrated Itinerary, on which are laid down the roads pursued by the Roman armies, in the reign of Theodosius the Great. Whether Andrew was the brother, or the cousin of John Paul Alciati, is uncertain. There were also a Melchior Alciati, and a Cardinal Francis Alciati. The Milanese branch of the family boasted of many eminent Jurists; but John Paul was educated for a Physician, which may account, in some measure, for his great intimacy with George Blandrata, who was brought up to the same profession. He afterwards accepted a military appointment,

according to the custom of his age; and is for this reason called by Beza a Milanese soldier.

On leaving Italy, he appears to have bent his course to Geneva, in which city he lived for some time with Blandrata, and joined the Church frequented by the Italian refugees. When Gentilis effected his escape from Geneva, and went to the village of Fargias, Alciati was staying there, as the guest of Gribaldus; and when the fugitive was arrested in his flight, and thrown into prison at Gex, he was set at liberty, by the friendly intercession of Alciati with the Chief Magistrate of that town.

In the year 1553, Blandrata, accompanied by Alciati, visited the Grisons, for the purpose of strengthening and encouraging those of his countrymen, who had embraced Antitrinitarian sentiments, and had sought a refuge among that people.

In 1562, we find Alciati in Poland, with Blandrata, actively employed in undermining the established faith. Ruarus, writing to Abraham Calovius, from Dantzic, says, "I remember to have been told by Andrew Voidovius, that Alciati, a pious man, as he said, and of the same way of thinking as Socinus, when he lived for some time at Cracow, and was in imminent danger of his life, from some petulant scholastics, because he was suspected of being what was then called *an Arian*, escaped by saying, in a sort of joke, that he was not *an Arian*, but a *Marian*. On being asked what that was, he replied, that he believed Jesus Christ to be the Son of the Living God and Mary; and when they heard the venerated name of Mary, they let him go uninjured, for they were as grossly ignorant, as they were malignant. From that time, I think, he transferred his residence to Dantzic." It appears, however, that he went with Gentilis into Moravia, and remained there some time, before he took up his abode at Dantzic.

De Porta likewise intimates, that Alciati and Blandrata paid a second visit to their brethren among the Grisons, and that, on the 11th of January, 1579, they were ordered by the assembly of the three estates, to quit the Rhætian territory; and were told, that, if they were found there after that notice, it would be at the hazard of their lives.

Some writers have asserted, that Alciati went from Moravia to Constantinople; and it is not improbable, that, in going from Poland into Moravia, or from Moravia into Prussia, he touched upon the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Bayer supposes, that, like Leonardo Bucali, he took refuge in Turkey from the persecution of his orthodox brethren; but for this supposition, though the thing is by no means improbable in itself, there are no proper historical grounds.

So late as 1586, forty years after the dispersion of the society at Vicenza, and at a time when he was probably a very old man, Alciati wrote to the Synod of Lublin, for permission to print Faustus Socinus's Reply to the Hortatory Letter of Andrew Volanus, "On the Nature and Expiation of Christ;" and offered to be at part of the expense. Bock says, that the Alciati who made this offer was without doubt a son of John Paul (Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 470); but in the Synodical Acts, the individual alluded to is called "*ALCIATUS Italus*," (p. 830,) a designation which evidently points to John Paul himself. Whether the offer was accepted does not appear: but some interest attaches to the fact of its having been made, from the circumstance of the above Reply being the first production of Socinus's pen, after he came into Poland. The author revised and corrected it in 1588, two years after Alciati's request to the Synod of Lublin; and offered it, in the same year, to the public eye, with a Dedication to John Kiszka.

That Alciati was a married man we learn from Ruarus:

and that his worldly circumstances were such as to enable him to live in comfort, if not in comparative affluence, seems highly probable. He is not known to have left any family; and the probability is that he died childless. Ruarus says, that his death took place at Dantzic. This statement is made in the letter to Calovius, referred to above. A rumour got abroad, that Alciati had renounced the religion of the Bible, and embraced that of the Koran; and Calovius had given too ready credence to this idle story. It is the object of Ruarus to set him right upon this point, which he does in the following words. "Whatever may have been the opinions of Gentilis, you might have known, that Alciati spent some years of his life in this city, as a Christian, with singular piety; and when on the point of death, commended his soul to Christ his Saviour. Catharine Weimer, my wife's grandmother, who knew him well as a neighbour, and was present at his death, and who herself died only three years ago, often mentioned this to her husband, David Werner Büttel, who is still living. My mother-in-law also told me, no longer ago than yesterday, that she had over and over again seen Alciati's widow in this city, and that she survived her husband some years." (Ep. 47.) Ruarus says nothing, in this letter, about the time of Alciati's death; and yet Bock appeals to it, as his authority for asserting, that Alciati died in the year 1565. (Hist. Socinianismi Prussici, § iii. p. 5.) But we learn from De Porta, a writer who is remarkable for the accuracy of his facts and dates, that Alciati was living in the year 1579. (Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræticularum, T. I. Lib. ii. C. xxiii. p. 632.)

With regard to the particular religious sentiments of Alciati, it is clear that they differed from those of Gentilis. He was neither a Tritheist, nor an Arian, properly so called, but rather a Humanitarian: for he believed that

Christ had no existence before his birth of the Virgin Mary. In his letters to Gregory Pauli, he says, that he regards the doctrine of the Mahometans as more consonant with reason, than that of the orthodox, concerning three persons in the essence of God; and we learn from Budzinius and Dudithius, that he wrote much on this subject. But neither Sandius nor Bock mentions any printed work, which claims him as its author.

The rumour respecting Alciati's defection from the Christian to the Mahometan faith, appears to have originated with Beza, who, in a letter, dated Geneva, Aug. 1567, abounding in the most palpable falsehoods, and full of that bitter and unchristian spirit which pervades nearly the whole of his writings, says, that Alciati deserted the Christian cause, and became a Mahometan. But this may only mean, in the current language of the day, that his sentiments were completely Unitarian. The same reproach was thrown out against other Unitarians of that period, from a notion, that to oppose the doctrine of the Trinity, and deny the preëxistence of Christ, was in effect to turn Mahometan; the fundamental tenet of the Mahometan religion being the simple unity of the Divine Nature. Pope Clement, in his speech to Charles V., says, that there are some, who have revived the error of Paul of Samosata, which he describes as nothing different from pure Mahometanism; and Cheynell, in his "Rise, Growth, and Danger of Socinianisme," (Ch. iv. p. 46,) observes, that "any Liturgy which will please one that is a thorow Socinian, will please Turkes, and Jewes also, if it be but warily composed, and they will keep themselves in such generall expressions as some doe too much affect." The same idea has sometimes been expressed by orthodox writers in our own times; and the comparison between the disciples of Socinus, and the followers of the Arabian Prophet, is pur-

sued at some length by Dr. White, in the "Notes and Authorities," subjoined to his celebrated "Bampton Lectures." If, however, Beza's assertion, respecting Alciati's change of faith, has any more definite meaning, and if we are to regard it as anything more than a loose and unguarded expression, intended to convey his extreme abhorrence of Socinianism, we can have no hesitation in pronouncing it a calumny.

The following are the only writings attributed to Alciati by Sandius and Bock.

1. Two Letters to Gregory Pauli, dated Austerlitz, 1564 and 1565. In these Letters Alciati endeavours to persuade his correspondent, that Christ had no existence before he was born of Mary.

2. Much more upon the same subject.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 27, 28. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 7, 8; T. II. pp. 465—470, et *passim*. Hist. Socin. Prus. l. c. *Lubieniecki* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. v. pp. 107. 109. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 47. *De Porta*, Hist. Reform. Ecclesiar. Reticar. l. c. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. J. P. ALCIAT. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. J. P. ALCIAT.

22.

GEORGE COMPLATIUS is mentioned in connexion with Servetus, Gentilis, Campanus, Gribaldus, Blandrata, Alciati, Ochinus, and Francis Davidis, by Albert Graver, in his "Dissertation on a new and horrid Error concerning the Satisfaction of Christ" (p. 6); and Sandius, in the Appendix to his "Nucleus Hist. Eccles.," (p. 90,) reckons him among the number of those, who fled from Italy, on the dissolution of the society at Vicenza, in 1546. No other mention appears to be made of him by literary historians, or bibliographers.

VIDEND. *Sandii* Nucl. H. E. App. p. 90. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 1070, 1071.

23.

JULIUS TREVISANUS and FRANCIS DE RUEGO were members of the society at Vicenza; and it is stated, by Sandius and others, that, when this society was broken up, in 1546, Julius Trevisanus and Francis De Ruego, being unable to make their escape, were seized, and put to death at Venice.

De Porta informs us, that Melanchthon, as early as the year 1539, addressed a letter to the Senate of Venice, in which he put the members of that body upon their guard against several Italians, who had been led, by a perusal of Servetus's "Books on the Errors of the Trinity," to give up that doctrine; it having been said, and that too by no vague report, that there were upwards of forty individuals of the first rank, and the highest literary distinction, in the city and territory of Venice, who had become infected with the notions of Servetus. The same historian professes his inability to say, whether this admonition was attended to; but adds, that he finds elsewhere an account of two men of this description, namely Julius Trevisanus and Francis De Ruego, who were deprived of life by submersion, and whom the Unitarians properly reckon among the number of their martyrs. (*Hist. Ref. Eccl. Ræt. T. I. L. ii. C. iii. p. 63.*)

It is not said, by any of the Unitarian writers who have mentioned the above fact, when this punishment was inflicted; and there are reasons for supposing, that it was not till after an imprisonment of fifteen, or twenty years. M'Crie remarks, that no one was capitally punished for religion at Venice before the year 1560; and adds, "I have little doubt, that the two persons referred to were Julio Guirlanda of the Trevisano, and Francesco Sega of Rovigo." (*Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, 2nd Ed. p. 267.*) The former of these is mentioned, as the first person, who suffered martyrdom at Venice, after the Reformation; and

the latter, who composed several pious works during his confinement, for the comfort of his fellow-prisoners, (which necessarily implies an imprisonment of considerable duration,) soon afterwards shared the same fate. Both of them were precipitated into the sea, with stones attached to them, for the purpose of sinking them;—a punishment, which it afterwards became customary to inflict upon reputed heretics at Venice. “If the *autos de fé* of the Queen of the Adriatic,” says M’Crie, (*ubi supra*,) in allusion to this custom, “were less barbarous than those of Spain, the solitude and silence with which they were accompanied were calculated to excite the deepest horror. At the dead hour of midnight, the prisoner was taken from his cell, and put into a gondola or Venetian boat, attended only, beside the sailors, by a single Priest, to act as Confessor. He was rowed out into the sea, beyond the Two Castles, where another boat was in waiting. A plank was then laid across the two gondolas, upon which the prisoner, having his body chained, and a heavy stone affixed to his feet, was placed; and, on a signal given, the gondolas retiring from one another, he was precipitated into the deep.” It is said of Julio Guirlanda, that, when set upon the plank, he cheerfully bade the captain farewell, and sank, calling on the Lord Jesus. His martyrdom is represented as having taken place on the 19th of October, 1562; and that of Francesco Segna de Rovigo, on the 25th of February, 1566. The author of the “*Histoire des Martyrs*,” in allusion to the cause of their death, uses the phrase, “*persecutée par nouveaux Ebionites*.”

VIDEND. *Wissowatii* Narrat. Compend. p. 210. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 425. *De Porta*, l. c. *M’Crie*, l. c. *Illgen*, Symb. ad Vit. et Doctr. L. Socini illustr. Partic. i. pp. 38. 68.

24.

JAMES DE CHIARI was a member of the society at Vicenza, who, in 1546, was seized by the officers of the Inquisition, and thrown into prison, where he died (what is called) a *natural* death: but his end was probably hastened by the severe treatment to which he was exposed.

VIDEND. Bock et Illgen, ubi supra. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. i. p. 39.

25.

FRANCIS NIGER, (*Ital.* FRANCESCO NEGRI,) of Bassano, on the dissolution of the society at Vicenza, in 1546, of which he is said to have been a member, escaped the vigilance of the officers of the Inquisition; but whether by flight, or by a temporary absence from the Venetian territory, is uncertain. Illgen has shewn, on the authority of De Porta, that Niger was at Chiavenna, a town of Switzerland, about the year 1543, which was three years before the dispersion of the members of that society. He was then living with Stancarus, and made common cause with Camillus Siculus, in the Sacramentarian controversy, which at that time excited much attention among the Grisons.

Mainardi, in a letter to Bullinger, describes Niger as a person of easy disposition, and not sufficiently firm and constant, but in other respects a good kind of man; and De Porta relates, at some length, how Niger, in conjunction with Camillus and P. P. Vergerius, disturbed the Church at Chiavenna by questions of an injurious tendency, and what trouble he gave to the Ministers of that town, mentioning, at the same time, the fact, that he exercised the office of Tutor in some distinguished families among the Grisons.

It is not known what precise opinions Niger held on the subject of the Trinity; but Bock has ascertained, that, after he left Chiavenna, he was living in Moravia, with

persons holding opinions similar to his own, and that, during his residence in that country, he either joined the Anabaptists, or was favourably disposed towards them.

There is no doubt, that he is the same person, who, under the name of *Franciscus Niger*, acquired a literary reputation, and wrote on the manners and customs of the Grisons. He is sometimes called *Bassanensis*, or *Bassianus*, from Bassano, the place of his birth; and he published, under the name of *Franciscus Niger Bassanensis*, “A brief History concerning the Death of Fanino Faventino, and Dominico Bassanensi, who not long ago were impiously put to Death in Italy, by the Command of the Roman Pontiff, for their religious Opinions, A.D. 1550,” 8vo. M’Crie says that he has never seen this work (Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Ch. v. p. 318); and, indeed, little more than the title of it seems to be now known. But it is thought, that, if a copy of it should come to light, it may tend to elucidate the brief and imperfect accounts, which we have of the society of Vicenza.

Another little book of Niger’s, the character of which was satirical, has been referred to under the title “*Tragedia di Libero Arbitrio, di F. N. B.*” Fontani characterizes this book as “*empia e diabolica*,” and Schellhorn has given extracts from it.

Niger was not, as some have stated, a Preacher; but confined himself to the instruction of youth.

Verci has given an account of his writings, and refuted the opinion of Quadrio, De Porta and others, that he was a native of Lovero, in the Valteline.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 409. 482. 548. 581. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt. T. I. L. i. C. x. p. 197; L. ii. C. iv. pp. 89. 96. 130—132. C. v. p. 172. *Illgen*, Symb. ad Vit. et Doctr. L. Socini illustr. P. i. C. iii. p. 39; C. v. p. 69. *M’Crie’s* Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, Chap. iv. pp. 183. 185; Chap. vi. pp. 384, 385, etc.

26.

DARIUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) was one of those, who escaped the vigilance of the inquisitors, when the society at Vicenza was broken up, in 1546. He resided for some years in different parts of Switzerland; but not finding himself sufficiently safe there, he removed into Poland, and finally into Moravia. Bock supposes him to have been a relation, but not a brother, of Lælius Socinus. Illgen assents to this opinion; and says, that Lælius, in his unedited Epistles, preserved in the library at Zurich, often makes mention of Darius, but adds nothing, from which it can be inferred, that he was his brother. His name is mentioned in the Synodical Acts of Coire.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 19. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 577. *Illgen*, Symbol. ad Vit. et Doctr. L. Socini illustr. P. i. pp. 38. 71.

27.

JOHN ASSHETON, a Priest, appears to have been the first Englishman, who was called to account, by the ecclesiastical authorities of this country, for broaching Unitarian opinions. In the course of his preaching, he denied the Trinity, and the Deity of the Holy Spirit; asserted the simple and proper humanity of Christ; and taught that the only benefit, which men receive through Christ, consists in their being brought to the true knowledge of God.

On the 28th of December, 1548, he was summoned to appear before Archbishop Crammer at Lambeth, where John Whitwel, the Archbishop's Almoner, and Thomas Langley, both Priests, and His Grace's Chaplains, exhibited a schedule of divers heresies against him. These are recited in the Abjuration which he made, the tenor of which was as follows.

“In the name of God, *Amen.* Before you, most learned Father in God, Thomas Archbishop, Primate and Metro-

politan of all England, Commissary of our most dread Sovereign Lord, and excellent Prince, Edward VI., by the grace of God, &c. I *John Assheton* Priest, of my pure heart, free-will, voluntary and sincere knowledge, confess and openly recognize, that in times past, I thought, believed, said, heard and affirmed these errors, heresies, and damnable opinions following; that is to say, 1. That the Trinity of persons was established by the Confession of Athanasius, declared by a Psalm, *Quicunq. vult*, &c. And that the Holy Ghost is not God, but only a certain power of the Father. 2. That Jesus Christ, that was conceived of the Virgin Mary, was a holy prophet, and especially beloved of God the Father; but that he was not the true and living God, forasmuch as he was seen and lived, hungered and thirsted. 3. That this only is the fruit of Jesus Christ's passion; that whereas we were strangers from God, and had no knowledge of his testament, it pleased God by Christ, to bring us to the acknowledging of his holy power by the testament. Wherefore I, the said *John Assheton*, detesting and abhorring all and every my said errors, heresies, and damned opinions, willingly, and with all my power, affecting hereafter firmly to believe in the true and perfect faith of Christ, and his holy Church, purposing to follow the true and sincere doctrine of holy Church with a pure and free heart, voluntarily mind, will, and intend utterly to forsake, relinquish, renounce and despise the said detestable errors, heresies, and abominable opinions; granting and confessing now, 1. That the blessed Trinity consisteth of three distinct persons, and one God-head; as God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, coëqual in power and might. 2. That Jesus Christ is both God and man, after his holy nature, eternally begotten of his Father, of his own substance; and in his humanity was conceived by the Holy Ghost incarnate,

and for our redemption, being very God, became Man. 3. That by the death of Jesus Christ we be not only made partakers of the testament, and so disposed to the knowledge of his godly will and power, but also that we have full redemption and remission of our sins in his blood."

To this Recantation he affixed his signature, in the presence of the Archbishop, declaring it to be his own act. Then, in a suppliant attitude, he implored His Grace to deal mercifully with him; at the same time pledging himself faithfully and humbly to obey the commands of the holy Mother-Church, and submit to any penance, which His Grace might think proper to inflict upon him.

"Thus," says the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, (*Hist. View*, Ch. ii. p. 69,) "by promises of life, and fears of the most dreadful sufferings, were unhappy men dealt with and prevailed upon, to make abjuration of their heresies, i. e. to dissemble, and speak contrary to their inward persuasion. For hardly any one, who, on such good grounds as this *Assheton*, believed Jesus Christ to be truly one of the human race; or who believed the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit, to be only the power of the Father; could soon, or indeed at all be brought to believe these two to be each of them the Most High God, and equal to the Father of all."

VIDEND. *Strype's Mem. of Cranmer*, Bk. ii. Ch. viii. p. 179. *Lindsey's Hist. View*, l. c.

28.

GEORGE VAN PARRIS, of Mentz, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, was a member of the Strangers' Church, in Augustin Friars, London. His profession was that of a Surgeon; and by a law, passed in the year 1531, strangers acting in that capacity within the realm of England, "were exempted from certain penal statutes, and not taken to be handicrafts-men." It was probably the existence of this

law, which induced George Van Parris, among other reasons, to settle in England.

He was admitted, by his fellow-worshippers, to be a person of undoubted piety and virtue; and according to Burnet, a Catholic writer said of him, "that he was a man of most wonderful strict life; that he used not to eat above once in two days; and before he did eat, would lie some time in his devotion prostrate on the ground." But being convicted of saying, that God the Father was the only God, and that Christ was not very God, and refusing to abjure, he was condemned to be burnt in Smithfield.

The Commission, under which he suffered, was issued on the 18th of January, 1551; and differed but little, in its preamble and contents, from that of 1549. Both were framed upon the model supplied by judicial forms, which had been in use, when England acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope. The name of Sir John Cheke, the King's Tutor, was added to those of the former Commissioners; and an opportunity soon presented itself of carrying into execution the formidable powers, with which they were invested. Joan Bocher had suffered for denying the *humanity* of Christ. George Van Parris was condemned, under this new Commission, for impugning the doctrine of his *divinity*.

The judicial proceedings against him were held at Lambeth, on the 6th of April, 1551, before Cranmer, Ridley, Coverdale, and six other Commissioners; but they were not instituted, till he was formally excommunicated by the Church, of which he had been a member. This fact is attested by the following entry in King Edward the Sixth's Journal. "1551, April 7. A certain Arrian, of the strangers, a Dutch Man, being excommunicated by the congregation of his country men, was, after long disputation, condemned to the fire."

Van Parris, if we are to believe Fox, was acquainted with no language but his own mother-tongue,—not even with that, in which sentence of condemnation was pronounced against him; and being unable to speak for himself, his examination was carried on through the medium of an interpreter. This interpreter was Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter. Through him Van Parris declared his belief, that it is no heresy to call God the Father the only God, or to say that Christ is not very God; and on being told, that it *was* heresy, and asked whether he would retract, and abjure it, he answered in the negative. After many attempts to shake his resolution, the Commissioners at length pronounced him an obstinate heretic; delivered him over to the secular power; and petitioned the King for his execution, declaring him at the same time to be “a child of the Devil, and an enemy of all righteousness.”

Great intercessions were made for him, but in vain. His sentence was carried into execution at Smithfield, April 25th, 1551; and he suffered with great constancy, kissing the stake, and the faggots, which were to burn him.

Fox throws the blame of this cold-blooded tragedy upon the Duke of Northumberland; and says, that it was contrary to the natural mildness of Cranmer's disposition. But Cranmer acquiesced in it; and there was no act of that Prelate's life, which exposed him to juster, and more deserved reproach, than this. It was said, by the Catholics, that they now saw men of blameless lives might be put to death for heresy, by the confession of the reformers themselves. In all the books published during the reign of Mary, justifying her severities against Protestants, instances like that of Van Parris were constantly produced; and when Cranmer himself was brought to the stake, they called it a just retribution. But neither arguments nor sufferings could convince the Divines of that age of the absurdity

and wickedness of putting men to death, for the sake of conscience. "These things," says Burnet, "cast a great blemish on the reformers. It was said they only condemned cruelty when it was exercised on themselves, but were ready to practise it when they had power. The Papists made great use of this afterwards in Queen Mary's time; and what Cranmer and Ridley then suffered, was thought a just retaliation on them, from that wise Providence, that dispenses all things justly to all men."

VIDEND. *Fox's Commentarii*, p. 202. *Burnet's Abridgment of Hist. of the Ref.* Vol. II. p. 82. *Neal's Hist. of the Puritans*, Index. *Chandler's Hist. of Persecution*, p. 312. *Lindsey's Apology* on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire, 3rd Ed. Chap. ii. p. 40. *R. G. S.* apud Mon. Rep. Vol. VII. (1812) pp. 439—442. *Christian Reformer* (O.S.) Vol. IV. etc.

29.

PATRICK PATINGHAM is said by Sandius, in his "Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ," (Ed. 1676,) to have been burnt as an Arian, at Uxbridge, in England, August 29th, 1555. The authority, on which this assertion is made, is Thomas Cooper's "Chronicle," which, as appears from Maitland's "Index of English Books in the Lambeth Library," (p. 26,) was published in 4to. by Thomas Berthelot, A. D. 1560, only five years after Patrick Patingham's death.

VIDEND. *Sandii Nucl. H. E.* p. 427. Maitland's Index, l. c.

30.

CHRISTOPHER VIRET, a Familist, was a joiner by trade, who lived in the borough of Southwark, in the reign of Mary. Honourable mention is made of him by the Ministers of Poland and Transylvania, in their treatise "Concerning the true and false Knowledge of God." He was a follower of Henry Nicolai, many of whose writings he translated from Dutch into English, as, "The Gospel of

the Kingdom," "The Prophecie of the Spirit of Love," "The Glass of Righteousnesse," &c. Out of these Ephraim Pagit professes to collect the following, among other errors:—"1. That Christ is not God; 2. That Christ is not one man; but an estate and condition in men, common to so many as have received H. N., his doctrine," &c. To their primary "Errours," which are ten in number, "Olde Ephraim Pagit," as that writer calls himself, adds fifteen others, the third of which is, "that it is ridiculous to say, 'God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost;' as though by saying these words, they should affirme to be three Gods." That Christopher Viret's efforts to extend the principles of the Familists were not unsuccessful, may be inferred from a work published in 1579, and bearing the following title. "A Confutation of monstrous and horrible Heresies, taught by H. N., and embraced by a Number, who call themselves the Family of Love: by I. Knewstub, &c. Imprinted in London at the Three Cranes in the Vine-tree, by Thomas Dawson, for Richard Sergier." 8vo. The Ever-memorable John Hales of Eton is said to have been a great reader of Stephanus, the Familist; and to have predicted, that the principles of this sect would one day have many admirers.

VIDEND. *Ephraim Pagit's Heresiography*, pp. 93—95.

31.

WILLIAM POWLING was a sawyer, of Thornham, in Kent, who, in the reign of Mary, made the following Confession, which was signed by himself; and countersigned by Nicholas Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury, Warham St. Leger, Thomas Roydon, George Clerk, and Thomas Hendle, as Commissioners and Witnesses.

"I. William Powling confesseth, That, before his imprisonment, he refused to come to the Church, because the

service is in a tongue that doth not edify; and he thinketh it contrary to God's word; and saith, that there are certain things used contrary to the Testament both Old and New. II. And saith That he doth not believe, that there is in the real natural body of our Saviour Jesus Christ the form of bread; and that it is no article of faith; and therefore refuseth to come to Church. III. And saith further, That it is no article of our faith, that there is One God and Three Persons, but One God Almighty, in whom he believeth; and saith that Christ is not almighty of himself, but received all power from his Father, and is made God over all things unto us; and saith, that he was not God of the same substance of God from the beginning. IV. And as for the Holy Ghost, he saith, That he believeth he is not God, but believeth he is the spirit of God the Father only, given to the Son, and not God of himself."

VIDEND. *Strype's Eccles. Mem.* Vol. III. p. 332.

32.

JOHN SIMMS was a parishioner of Brencchley, in Kent. He was charged, in the reign of Mary, with holding the following opinions.

"That they that did not understand the Latin tongue, should not have the service of the Church in the same tongue; because it doth not edify. That those that were lately burned were saved. That there is not the real body of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the form of bread. That it is against Scripture to burn heretics, because of the parable of the man that did sow cockle among the good seed. And lastly, That he did not believe that Christ is Consubstantial, that is to say, God from the beginning, and of one substance with the Father; and that there is One God and Three Persons. But he believeth the Father,

the Word, and the Holy Ghost is One God, but not Three Persons."

VIDEND. *Strype's Eccles. Mem.* ubi supra.

33.

ROBERT KING was an inhabitant of Petham, in Kent, against whom the following articles were exhibited in the reign of Mary.

"That he was against the Latin service. That he did not believe the natural presence. *Item*, That if any man can shew him in Scripture the word *Consubstantial*, then he will believe that Christ is *Consubstantial*, and of one substance with the Father, or else not. *Item*, he saith, That if any man can shew him the word *Person* in the Scripture, in the same sense, that then he will believe that there are Three Persons and One God, or else not. *Item*, he saith, he doubted, whether it can be proved by Scripture, that the Holy Ghost is God, or no? *Item*, he saith, That it is not lawful to put a man to death for his conscience sake. Witnesses, Nic. Harpsfield, Tho. Hende, Hen. Bouchier, Tho. Taylor, John Raynold, Walter Herender."

VIDEND. *Strype's Eccles. Mem.* Vol. III. p. 333.

34.

JAMES ACONTIUS, (*Ital.* GIACOMO ACONZIO,) was born at Trent, early in the sixteenth century. We learn from a letter, addressed by him to John Wolfius, of Zurich, that he was educated for the profession of the Law, and afterwards spent many years in a Court; not, however, basking in its luxurious ease and blandishments, but engaged in the duties of a laborious department. In another letter, addressed to his friend, Francis Betti, he speaks of their being joint exiles from their native country, for the sake of the Gospel.

Acontius left Italy in 1557, and settled in England, where he was employed by Queen Elizabeth in the capacity of a military engineer. He joined the Strangers' Church in Augustin Friars, London; and incurred the censure of Grindal, on account of the freedom of his religious opinions. Little is known of his subsequent history; but Cheynell informs us, that he was living as late as the year 1613. (*The Divine Trinunity*, p. 443.)

Peltius, in the Dedication of his "*Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum*," calls him "*clandestinus Socinianorum assecla*;" and Pareus, in a letter written March 1st, 1613, and addressed to N. N., mentions him, in connexion with Bonfinius, as secretly favouring the Socinians. Voetius says, that the Arminians made great use of him; and that he was but one remove from a Socinian, or was guilty at least of a Socinian syncretism, because he expressly condemns the heresy of the Sabellians, while he tacitly favours that of the Photinians. "This moderate man," says Cheynell, (p. 446,) "did never say, that it was necessary for our Salvation to know and beleieve that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one and the same God, who is the only true God blessed for ever." Peter Ramus testifies his admiration of Acontius, as one who has long been favourably known to the world by the excellent monuments of his wisdom; and Commenius makes honourable mention of him, in the Preface to his "*Idea or Epitome of Natural Philosophy*." Rivet speaks of him as the forerunner, or fellow-soldier of the Socinians; and Arminius calls him "*divinum prudentiæ et moderationis lumen*."

He was the author of a Latin work in eight books, entitled "*Satanæ Stratagemata*," which he dedicated to his patron, Queen Elizabeth. From this work it has been inferred, both by orthodox and heterodox readers, that he was an Antitrinitarian. "It is his maine business and

designe in his third Book," says Cheynell, (p. 447,) "which is now in English, and in his seventh, which I hope will never be Englished, to shew, what are the only points necessary to be beleaved for the attainment of Salvation. But Acontius is not very modest when he comes to pass sentence upon the Ancients, who were rigidly Orthodoxe, and faithfully severe in requiring men to beleave those grand Articles of Faith, which are necessary to Salvation. For when he discourses of the faith of the man sick of the Palsie, he saith, 'Credebat enim (ut par est,) hominem eum qui Jesus diceretur, &c.' 'For he believed (in all probability, saith the Translatour) that that same man whose name was Jesus came from God, and was in favour with God; and therefore he hoped that by this means he might recover his health. But that he knew all those things which the Church hath for a long time accounted as Articles of Faith necessary to be beleaved to Salvation, how likely a matter it is, I leave it to every man to judge. There are likewise many other Texts to the very same purpose.' Concerning the faith of Abraham he speaks somewhat like an Arminian, and an Anabaptist, but concludes like a Socinian; that Abraham did beleave, 1. That he should be the Father of many Nations. 2. That the Nations should be happy by his seed. 3. Somewhat concerning the Land of Canaan. 'But,' saith he, 'of those points of Religion which it is judged every body is bound to know upon pain of damnation, we read not a word. Yea, and the mystery of Salvation itself by his seed is very closely and obscurely promised.' I know Acontius doth acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, and to be God, and so do the Socinians in some sense, as we have shewn: But then Acontius qualifies all with a pretty diversion. 'Many things,' saith he, 'may be reckoned up, which that we might be saved, ought both to be, and to be performed:

As that our sins were to be abolished, and that by a man void of all sin, and of infinite virtue and power, and he therefore to be the Son of God, yea, God, and the like.' And then he presently mixes some things of lesse consequence, and concludes thus. 'Doubtless that it may evidently appeare to us that these things are likewise necessary to be known, either we must have a plain Text of Scripture that shall pronounce, Whatsoever is necessary to be done, that also (to attain Salvation) must necessarily be beleaved.—But there is no Testimony of Scripture that I know which pronounces, That what ever ought to be done ought to be beleaved.' By this one taste you may plainly see, that though it should be granted necessary unto Salvation, that Christ should be God, abolish sin, &c., yet Acontius will not grant, that this is necessary to be beleaved for the attainment of Salvation; and therefore he left it out of his Catholick Creed, and Syncretisme, and yet condemns the Sabellians, who did not deny the Godhead of Christ, but said that he was one God (and somewhat which they should not have said, or beleaved, that he was one Person) with God the Father. You may hereby understand the modesty of the man, and cry out as he did, 'En modestiam satis perfrictam, usque ad os impudentiæ perfrictam.' But if his seventh Book (which the Translatour durst not adventure to English till he saw how this would take) had been translated, I need not have said any more for the discovery of this subtile Sir."

The "*Satanæ Stratagemata*" was first printed at Basle in 1565. A second edition of it appeared at the same place in 1610, to which was added a Letter by the author, "*De Ratione edendorum Librorum.*" A third edition was printed at Oxford in 1631; and a fourth at Amsterdam in 1674.

"It is impossible," says a writer in the "*Monthly Re-*

pository," (Vol. XVI. pp. 456—458,) "to read the work of this great man, without being delighted with the amiable and enlightened spirit which breathes through every page. To our shame be it spoken, that, although from the circumstances under which it was written, it is peculiarly connected with England, it has never been translated (at least in a complete state) into our own language. But it had the misfortune of too far anticipating the progress of civilization. Had it been less excellent, it would have been more prized. The highest eulogium will be pronounced upon it, if I say that some of the finest passages of Milton's *Areöpagitica*, may be traced to Acontius. It is melancholy, however, to see how popular prejudices affect the greatest works, even when the author has freed his own opinions from their thralldom."

"Some said of him," writes the author of "Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness," (pp. 223, 224,) "that he had a mind to reduce all sects into one, and inclose them in the same ark, as Noah did all sorts of animals in his, wherein they were preserv'd, tho' sustained by different food: others accuse him, that by reducing the points necessary to salvation to a small number, and requiring a toleration for the particular opinions, which were against the other articles, he open'd a wide door to all manner of heresies."

The first four Books of "*Satanæ Stratagemata*" were translated into English, and published by John Goodwin, in 1648, 4to., under the title of "*Satan's Stratagems, or the Devil's Cabinet-Council discovered.*" The translation was not a very happy one, and was far from doing justice to the powerful reasoning of Acontius. John Goodwin, however, was not unworthy of the cause; for his Epistle to the Reader proves him to have been firmly attached to the great principles of religious liberty. The translation

probably had a slow sale ; for in the year 1651, a part of the impression of 1648 was re-issued, with the following title. “ Darkness Discovered, or the Devil’s secret Stratagems laid open.”

Acontius’s works were

1. The Stratagems of Satan. Basle, 1565. 1610. 1631. 1674.

2. On the Method of publishing Books. 1610.

3. The right Method of investigating and transmitting Arts and Sciences. 1658.

4. A Letter inserted in the Second Part of Thomas Crenius’s *Animadv. Philolog. et Historic. Cap. iv. § ix.* To whom this Letter was addressed is unknown, as the manuscript from which it was printed was much soiled and worn, and the direction was lost.

VIDEND. *Lindsey’s Hist. View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship from the Reformation to our own Times.* Lond. 1783, 8vo. Chap. ii. pp. 79—84. *M. D. II.* apud Mon. Rep. Vol. XVI. (1821) p. 456. *Cheyne’s Rise, Growth and Danger of Socinianisme.* Lond. 1643, 4to. Chap. iv. pp. 36—39. *Cheyne’s Divine Trinunity.* Lond. 1650, 8vo. pp. 441—459. *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness: by B. M.* 2nd Ed. Lond. 1729, 12mo. l. c. *Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. ACONCE. T. Crenii Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. ii. C. ii. § ii.* pp. 30—33; C. iv. § ix. pp. 131—138.

35.

FRANCIS BETTI, a noble Roman of the sixteenth century, and an exile from his country on account of his religion, took up his residence at Basle. He was the friend and correspondent of Acontius, who, in a Dedicatory Epistle to one of his works, cited by Bayle, thus addresses him. “ The laborious and anxious employment in which we have long been engaged together, the similarity of our studies and inclinations, and, what is above all, our union of sentiment in religion, and the resolution which we have

taken of abandoning our native country for the sake of it, have knit us together in the dearest and most indissoluble bonds of friendship."

At the period in which Francis Betti and Acontius lived, Italy was fruitful in men of learning and piety, who made the most costly sacrifices, to enjoy the Christian religion, in its native purity and simplicity; and it is much to be lamented, that Ecclesiastical History has preserved so few traces of these disinterested and high-minded individuals, many of whom possessed far clearer views of religious liberty and Christian truth, than those of their contemporaries, whom we are generally taught to regard as the most distinguished luminaries of the Reformation. Of the personal history of Francis Betti, few traces now remain; but the little which is known of him is highly honourable to his character. Peter Ramus, who lost his life in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, mentions him, in the following terms, among the friends whom the University of Basle entertained as its guests. "Italy has scarcely reckoned in the number of her sons two more candid and pious men, than Francesco Betti and Sylvestro Teglio. Betti, in his native language, instructs his country in the truths of Christianity. Teglio has made Machiavelli's 'Prince' speak Latin, and is daily raising loftier monuments of his own fame."

Nicholas Camulius, a wealthy merchant, and liberal patron of Antitrinitarians, in a letter written about the year 1563, associates the name of Francis Betti with that of Darius [Socinus], as being then expected at Zurich; but whether as a guest, or a permanent resident does not appear. Betti was also upon terms of the closest intimacy with Faustus Socinus, and was a fellow-sufferer with him in the cause of Christian truth. Boeck reckons him among the number of Crypto-Socinians, who had taken up their residence at

Basle. (Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 665.) When Faustus Socinus came to that city, Francis Betti was residing there; and Faustus calls him "his very particular, and very old friend, a pious man, and one not moderately versed in religious controversy." During Betti's residence at Basle, Francis Pucci occasionally wrote to him about his opinions; and in the course of their correspondence, Betti told him, that Socinus was at Basle, and that, if they should ever chance to meet, he would gain a clearer knowledge of the truth from his intercourse with Socinus. In consequence of this, Pucci left England, and went into Switzerland, where, in 1578, he held his celebrated Disputation with Socinus, "On the State of the First Man before the Fall."

Betti was the author of a letter to the accomplished Marchioness of Pescara, Vittoria Colonna, in which he mentions the reasons of his departure from Italy. To this letter Jerome Mutius published a reply, entitled, "*Risposta di Girolamo Muzio a una lettera di Francesco Betti, scritta alla Marchesa di Pescara. Pisauri, A. 1558,*" 8vo.

In the Expurgatory Indexes, the name of Francis Betti is placed among those of heretics of the first class.

VIDEND. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Chap. ii. p. 80, Note (c). *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 665. 817. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt. T. I. L. ii. C. xx. p. 544. *Schellhornii* Diss. Epist. de Mino Celso, p. 62, Not. (e).

36.

HADRIAN CORNELIUS HÄMSTED was one of the Ministers of the Strangers' Church, Augustin Friars, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Strype says, that he "was touched with Anabaptistical and Arian principles; and had divers followers, shrouding themselves under the wings of this Church." But though he pleaded for a toleration of the Anabaptists, he denied that he had any connexion with

that sect. "Being otherwise outwardly sober and quiet men," says Strype, (*Life of Grindal*, p. 43,) "and pretending zealously to believe and worship Christ, and to expect salvation by him, the abovesaid Hadrian took their parts, and laboured much for their peaceable and quiet subsistence, and enjoyment of their opinions till they were farther enlightened. And he declared how this gentle behaviour towards them was the likeliest way to win them from their error. Hadrian himself was a sober and pious man, and gave himself out to be no Anabaptist in his own judgment; but firmly held that Christ's taking flesh of the virgin, was a thing necessary to salvation. But he was for tolerating these men that held the contrary; and wrote a paper consisting of various arguments for the same. Wherein he ran out into many dangerous expressions, and vented divers unsound tenets."

His sentiments respecting the forbearance due to the Anabaptists, on account of their alleged errors, very much resembled those of his friend and fellow-worshiper, Acontius. Both fell under the displeasure of Grindal, and incurred the odium of an ecclesiastical censure.

Vogt includes the following in his *Catalogue of Rare Books* (p. 326). "Adriani Cornelii Hæmstedii Gheschiedenisse ende den Doodt der vroomen Martelaren, de om het Ghetugghenisse des Evangeliums haer Bloedt ghestort hebben, van den Tyden Christi af tot den Jare 1559, toe, by een vergaderd up het Kortste, A. 1559, d. 18. Martii, in 4. pagg. 451." This Martyrology is now seldom to be met with; and was the first work of its kind which appeared in the Dutch language. John Guyse, Pastor of Streetkerk, published a castigated edition of it, after the lapse of a century, in 1658. This edition was embellished with a hundred and fifty copper-plate engravings, and augmented by accounts of eighty additional martyrs.

VIDEND. *Strype's Life of Grindal*, pp. 42, 43. *Lindsey's Hist. View*, Chap. ii. pp. 81—84. *Vogt, Catal. Libr. Rar.* pp. 326, 327.

37.

CATHARINE VOGEL, (or, as the name is written by Count Krasinski, WEYGEL,) wife of Melchior Vogel, a goldsmith, and Alderman of Cracow, was tried before the Ecclesiastical Court of that diocese, on a charge of apostasy from the Christian faith, and burnt to death, at the advanced age of eighty, in the market-place of that city, A.D. 1539. When asked about her creed, she replied, "I believe in the existence of one God, who has created all the visible and invisible world, and who cannot be conceived by the human intellect." Lubieniecius speaks of her chiefly as protesting against the sacrifice of the mass (*Hist. Ref. Pol. L. i. C. v. p. 17*); and Budzinius, who calls her *Zalasowska*, in the 4th Chapter of his manuscript "Commentaries," written in the Polish language, seems to have regarded her as the first Polish Antitrinitarian. Lubieniecius further says, that he had found, in the Chronicle of Gornicki, a contemporaneous historian, that she was suspected of Judaism; but this may have been, as Lubieniecius thinks, (*ubi supra*), only because she denied, that the Son of God was begotten from eternity of the substance of the Father. Whatever may have been her opinions, she remained firm in the profession of them, notwithstanding the admonitions of her judges; and suffered death with the most heroic courage. Her execution was chiefly occasioned by Gamrat, Bishop of Cracow, a favourite of Queen Bona, and a man of the most profligate character.

VIDEND. *Lubienieci's Hist. Ref. Pol. L. i. C. v. p. 17. Count Valerian Krasinski's Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland. Lond. 1838, 8vo. Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. i. pp. 131, 132, and Ref.*

38.

GEORGE BLANDRATA, (*Ital.* BIANDRATA,) was a native of Saluzzo, in Piedmont. He followed the profession of a Physician; and, by means of his great talents, and insinuating address, became a favourite with many persons of eminence, both in his own, and in foreign countries.

In the year 1553, we find him and Alciati paying a visit to their Unitarian friends in the country of the Grisons, on their way from Italy into Switzerland. But, if we are to credit the account of Bock, it was not till about the year 1556 that Blandrata settled at Geneva. It appears that he was in Poland during the preceding year; and had already practised there as a Physician.

On revisiting Italy, he was thrown into the prison of the Inquisition at Pavia, but contrived to make his escape, and fled to Geneva. There he joined the religious society, which had been formed by the Italian refugees; and which contained, among the number of its members, several, who had renounced the doctrine of the Trinity. While at Geneva, he often conversed with Calvin, in whose works may be seen the answers which Calvin returned to his questions. He professed himself under great obligations to Calvin; but when his heretical tendencies began to develop themselves, Calvin caused him to be apprehended, and would probably have doomed him to the fate of Servetus, if he had not subscribed to the Confession of the Church of Geneva.

Finding his situation at Geneva attended with some danger, he left that city in 1558, and went again into Poland, where he took an active part in the religious discussions, by which that kingdom was agitated. An attempt was made at a Synod, held during that year at Pinczow, to silence the Unitarian party, of which Blandrata was one of the leaders; and the doctrine of the Trinity met with

able defenders in John a Lasco, and Stanislaus Sarnicki, Chaplain of Bonar, Castellan of Biecz. But the efforts of these zealous champions were unsuccessful; and that Synod, instead of silencing the Unitarians, was mainly instrumental in the development of their opinions. Blandrata took particular care to clothe his sentiments in scriptural language; and by not shocking the prejudices of his opponents, but appearing rather to agree with them in all that was essential, gradually brought many of them round to his own views. Calvin, who carefully watched his movements from a distance, was mortified to find in what high estimation Blandrata was held by the Polish reformers; and urgently admonished them not to trust him. Blandrata now discovered, as Bayle observes, that Divines of Calvin's eminence have long arms. But notwithstanding the opposition of the Calvinistic party, the opinions of Blandrata continued to gain new adherents.

He attended the seventeenth Synod, at Xionx, in the month of September, 1560; and was at that time appointed one of the Superintendents of the Helvetic Church, in Little Poland. He was also present at the nineteenth Synod, at Pinczow, in January, 1561, as the delegate of Prince Nicholas Radzivil, when Peter Statorius is reported to have said, that all the friends of Blandrata, by some means or other, fell under a suspicion of heresy. At the twentieth Synod, which was held at Cracow, on the 16th of September, in the same year, Martin Czechovicus produced a letter of Calvin's, in which he exhorted the Cracovians and Pinczovians to beware of Blandrata. Jerome Ossolinski, on hearing this letter, broke out into these words. "Would that writings concerning the Trinity were not disseminated!" meaning such writings as attempted to explain that doctrine by terms of mere human invention. Lismaninus is reported to have joined with Blandrata in

saying, at this Synod, "Let all the Doctors leave me one God, and not divide him; and then they may have what Mediator they please." Before the Synod broke up, Blandrata was ordered to commit to writing a Confession of his Faith, which he did, and presented it at the next Synod, held at Xionx, in March, 1562, when it was privately read, and met with the approbation of some, and the disapprobation of others. But so powerful had his party now become, that, at the following Synod, held at Pinczow, April the 21st, in the same year, and consisting of twenty-eight Ministers, and twelve lay patrons, a resolution was passed, which amounted to a virtual abandonment of the contest, on the part of the orthodox. "All researches about the Trinity, Mediation, Incarnation," says Krasinski, "were to be abandoned: all expressions unknown to the primitive Church were prohibited. The Ministers were to preach the pure words of the Gospel, unadulterated by any human explanations. The decisions of the Councils held after the apostolical times were declared not binding. Sarnicki, who perceived that this resolution was passed in order to conceal the real opinion of its framers, proposed that all the Ministers maintaining the supremacy of the Father over the Son should resign their offices, but his proposition was rejected, by which the anti-Trinitarian bias of the Synod became evident." (*Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland*, by Count Krasinski, Vol. I. pp. 356, 357.) At this Synod Blandrata's Confession was publicly read; but being expressed in the words of Scripture, it excited little discussion.

Having now sown the seeds of Unitarianism in Poland, he determined, in the year 1563, to accept an invitation, which had been sent him by John Sigismund, Prince of Transylvania, to whom he thenceforward acted in the capacity of Physician, and who soon became a convert to

his religious opinions. His office, as Court Physician, afforded him peculiar facilities for extending his influence, and propagating his doctrines, among the principal families in Transylvania; and he was not slow to avail himself of these facilities. The result was, that not only the Prince himself, but the chief Nobles of the country, adopted his views, and coöperated with him in their diffusion.

After the death of John Sigismund, Blandrata returned to Poland, and held the office of Physician to Stephen Bathory, when that Prince obtained the crown of Poland. He had taken Francis Davidis with him into Transylvania, and was not a little indebted to that learned and excellent man, for the success which attended his efforts to obtain proselytes to his opinions. But he was much disturbed at the objections made by Davidis to the worship of Jesus Christ; and being anxious that this worship should be maintained in the Churches of Transylvania, but unable, by argument or entreaty, to bring Davidis over to his own views, he called in to his assistance the celebrated Faustus Socinus, who was then at Basle, in Switzerland. With this object he prevailed upon Davidis to accommodate F. Socinus as his guest, that they might debate the matter between themselves, Blandrata undertaking to repay Davidis all the expenses of board and lodging. This was in the year 1578. (Vide *Art.* 78.)

In 1579, Blandrata again joined Alciati in a tour through the Rhætian Alps; but after this we hear little of him.

He was a man of uncommon penetration and address, and was well acquainted with all the arts and intrigues of Courts. In the end, however, he became a melancholy example of the pernicious effects of ambition and worldly-mindedness; for, at the close of his life, he deserted the cause, of which he had been so zealous an advocate, and

took part with the Jesuits, who were received into favour during the reign of Stephen Bathory.

His profession had enabled him to realize an ample fortune; and as age advanced, his love of money increased. But he had no children to inherit his property, for he lived and died a bachelor. He resolved, therefore, to adopt a nephew as his heir, who, eager to come into possession, caused his uncle to be strangled in his bed.

In what year the death of Blandrata occurred, cannot, with any degree of certainty, be determined. He was living, according to Sandius, about the year 1585, but did not survive the year 1592. Some say, that his death took place in 1586; others make him to have died on the 14th of May, 1588.

According to Bock, the writings in which Blandrata was more or less concerned, are twenty-seven in number: but some of these are mentioned in connexion with his name, only because they were published in Transylvania in his time, or under his auspices. The following is an abridged account of them.

1. Questions, to which Calvin has replied in the Acts of Valentine Gentilis. Fol. 50—56.

2. A Confession of Faith concerning the Holy Trinity, which Blandrata exhibited at the Synod of Pinczow, A.D. 1562.

3. A Letter to Gregory Pauli, dated Weissenburg, Nov. 30th, 1565.

4. A Letter to the Churches of Little Poland, written Jan. 27th, 1568, and inserted by Lubieniecius in his "History of the Polish Reformation." (L. iii. C. xi. p. 229.)

5. A Catechism, which was read at a public or general Synod held at Radnothin, in 1558.

6. Nine Theses concerning God and his Son Christ.

7. Thirty other Theses opposed to three Theses of F. Davidis, printed in 1578, 8vo.

8. Some remarkable Passages of Scripture in Defence of the Invocation of Christ.

9. Objections to F. Socinus's Refutation of the Theses of F. Davidis, written in 1579, and printed in 1595.

10. Three Letters to James Palæologus, dated Weissenb., Aug. 3rd, 1578; March 18th, 1579; and Jan., 1580.

11. A Letter to Gregory Pauli, George Schomann, Martin Czechovicius, Alexander Vitrelinus, and other Ministers of the Polish Churches of Jesus Christ crucified, by George Blandrata and Faustus Socinus, in the Name of the Transylvanian Church of the same Confession. A. D. 1579.

12. The first Disputation held at Weissenburg, Feb. 24th, 1566. This was printed in the same year at Clausenburg.

13. A Demonstration of the Falsity of the Doctrine of Peter Melius and others. 1567.

14. Two Books on the false and true Knowledge of the One God the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, by the Ministers of the Churches of Poland and Transylvania. Weissenburg, 1567, 4to. To this work references are made by Sandius, in his accounts of John Valdez, Martin Cellarius, and other Antitrinitarian authors. The same writer also gives the heads of the principal topics discussed in this volume. (Bibl. Ant. pp. 30—32.)

15. A Brief Narrative of the [second] Disputation concerning the Triune God and the twofold Nature of Christ, held March 8th, 1568. This was printed at Weissenburg, in 4to., during the same year.

16. Antitheses to Peter Melius's Interpretation of John i.; to which, according to Sandius, (B. A. p. 33,) were

added, Seventeen Theses, and Thirty-six Arguments against Infant Baptism.

17. Antithesis of Pseudo-Christ with the true Christ born of Mary. Weissenb. 1568, 4to.

18. Synonymous Scriptural Phrases concerning Christ, the Son of God, born of Mary. Weissenb. 1568, 4to.

19. On the Divinity and Equality of the Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus. Weissenb. 1568, 4to.

20. Refutation of a Writing of Peter Melius, in which he teaches, in the name of the Synod of Debreczin, a Jehovality, and a Trinitarian God, unknown to the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles. This and No. 13 were prepared before the second Disputation at Weissenburg. The date of its publication was somewhere about the year 1568.

21. Refutation of a Writing of George Major, in which he has endeavoured to prove, that God is three in Person, and one in Essence. This was written jointly by F. Davidis and G. Blandrata; and is supposed to have been printed at Weissenburg in 1569.

22. Refutation of the Confession of Peter Melius. This may have been written by F. Davidis.

23. Antitheses opposed to the sixteen Theses of F. Davidis, which were exhibited at the General Synod of Thorda, April 26th, 1579.

24. Antithesis on the first Chapter of John according to the Doctrine of the Sophists. This appears to be the same as No. 16.

25. A Letter of the Transylvanian Churches to those of Poland on the Subject of Baptism, written in 1566, and intended to prove, that this rite is no longer obligatory upon Christians. Badzinius inserted a copy of this Letter in the 45th Chapter of his MS. History; but it is doubtful

whether it was written by Blandrata, Davidis, or James Palæologus.

26. Seven Theses with Antitheses concerning the Trinity, presented to the Synod at Thorda, in the year 1566.

27. The outline of a work, in two parts, on the Reign of Christ and Antichrist. Weissenb. 1569, 4to. Bock, who gives the contents of this book, says, that a comparison of it with the “Christianismi Restitutio” of Servetus, clearly shews, that it is little more than an abridgment of that work.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 28—34. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 55—66; T. II. pp. 470—481, et *passim*. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art. BLANDRATA*. *Lubieniecii* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. vi. et *passim*. *Joh. Stoinii* Epitome Hist. Orig. Unitarior. in Polonia: *passim*. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Ch. iii. Sect. i. pp. 155—161. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Ch. viii. p. 351, etc.

39.

FRANCIS LISMANINUS, (*Ital.* LISMANINI,) was a native of the island of Corfu. He has been variously called, by those who were ignorant of his name, *Lisinan*, *Lismannus* and *Lismanius*. He was brought up to the Church, and became a Doctor of Theology, and a Monk of the Franciscan order. He was Provincial of that order in Poland; and was appointed Chaplain and Confessor to Bona Sforza, mother of Sigismund I. Lubieniecus relates, that the Queen put the Sermons of Ochinus into his hands; and that the perusal of these first raised doubts in his mind, as to the truth of the Catholic religion. Dissatisfied with the prevailing sentiments respecting the doctrines of Christianity, he was induced to seek for information wherever he could find it. The Queen, who was under the influence of the Spanish court, was not naturally disposed to favour innovations in the province of religion; but when she had

a favourite object to accomplish, she was not scrupulous as to the means which she employed. Orthodox and heretic were both alike to her, so that she could succeed in promoting her own designs. It has been observed, that, whoever gave her the name of *Bona*, or *the Good*, at her baptism, practised a cheat upon the world; a sentiment, which is not ill expressed in the following epigrammatic verses, which Lubieniecius has preserved, in his "History of the Polish Reformation." (L. i. C. v. p. 37.)

Qui tibi cunque Bonæ, sacris dum tingeris undis,
Imposuit nomen, omnibus imposuit.

Lismaninus was one of the earliest patrons of the reformed doctrines in Poland; and the Queen is said to have assisted him, in procuring works from abroad, favourable to these doctrines. A secret society, for promoting reforms in the body of the Catholic Church, was established at Cracow; and of this society Lismaninus became an active member. It consisted of some of the most learned men of the day, among whom were John Tricesius, or Trzecieski, the most eminent grammarian in Poland; Andrew Tricesius, his son, also an eminent scholar, and great linguist, and Bernard Wojewodka, a learned bookseller, and Alderman of Cracow, both pupils of the great Erasmus; Andrew Fricius Modrevius, a pupil of Melancthon, and Secretary to the King; James Prilusius, or Przyluski, an eminent Lawyer, who held an office under the Crown; Andrew Drzewiecki, Canon of the Cathedral of Cracow, and a favourite scholar of Erasmus; and John Uchanski, Referendary of the Crown, and afterwards Archbishop of Gnezno. When the members met, Lismaninus expounded different points of divinity with the utmost freedom, not sparing some of the most favourite doctrines of the Romish Church. The true character of this society becoming

known, Samuel Maciejowski, Bishop of Cracow, ordered the library of Lismaninus to be searched, in the confident expectation of finding something whereby to impeach his orthodoxy; but Lismaninus having been informed of the Bishop's intentions, removed from his shelves all works of a suspicious character, and when the search was made, nothing was discovered to inculcate him. Still the Bishop was not satisfied; and when Lismaninus was sent to Rome to congratulate Julius III. on his elevation to the Papal See, in 1549, Maciejowski represented him as a heretic of the most dangerous kind. Again, however, Lismaninus, who had been warned of the Bishop's machinations, contrived to elude them, and returned in safety to Poland, after the object of his mission was accomplished.

When Lælius Socinus, after an absence of several years from his native country, took his first journey into Poland, in the year 1551, he completed the conversion of Lismaninus; and prevailed upon him to lay aside his monkish dress.

Lismaninus's connexion with the Queen-mother gave him frequent opportunities of conversing with the King; and their conversation often turned upon religious subjects. At this time, the works of Calvin, particularly his "Institutes" and "Commentaries," began to be read in Poland. Sandius informs us, that a copy of the latter, which had been given by Lismaninus to George Schomann, a Minister at Pinczow, and which contained several manuscript notes of Lismaninus, accidentally fell into his own hands. Among other remarks, the following distich, occasioned by Calvin's note upon Acts xx. 28, in which he calls Servetus "*Hispanicus Canis*," is worthy of notice.

Cur tibi sum, Calvine, canis? Tuus efficit ardor,
Ne canis, heu! dicar, sed miseranda cinis.

Lismaninus was in the habit of going to the King every

Wednesday and Friday, and of reading to him, after dinner, the "Institutes" of Calvin; and conversing with him on all the separate points of doctrine, in the order in which Calvin considered them. On these occasions, each expressed himself with perfect freedom; and their intercourse was of the most unreserved description. The curiosity of the King being thus awakened, and his attention directed to the events which were passing, in countries to which the principles of the Reformation had extended, he became anxious to know, what changes had taken place in the religious state of Germany, and other parts of Europe. Accordingly, it was agreed, in the year 1553, that Lismanninus should procure a supply of books on various subjects, for the royal library, and that he should visit the pious and learned of other countries, and collect all the information that he could respecting different Churches, their institutions, rites, and modes of discipline, and make a full report to the King of all which he might hear or see in the course of his travels.

Cloppenburg says, that, in the month of June, 1553, a Synod was held at Mordy, in Poland, at which Lismanninus, complaining that his salary had been withheld, by the nobility, on account of his having been charged with Arianism, he obtained a certificate on the 9th of that month, entirely absolving him from the charge; on the strength of which he went to Zurich. But Lubieniecious tells us, that he first spent a semester at Venice; that he next visited Padua; and that he afterwards went to Milan. At the last of these places, he fell under a suspicion of heresy; but, on exhibiting the royal passport, he was allowed to proceed on his journey into Switzerland.

At Zurich, he saw, with great pleasure, for the first time in his life, the Lord's Supper administered, without any of the parade which accompanies it in the Catholic Church;

and was introduced to some of the great lights of the Reformation,—Rudolph Gualther, Conrad Pellican, Henry Bullinger, Theodore Bibliander, Leo Juda, Conrad Gesner, and others. He then went to Bern and Geneva, and passed on, by way of Lyons, to Paris. But instead of returning, agreeably to his promise, to communicate to the King the result of his inquiries, he went back to Geneva; and was induced, by the urgent entreaties of Calvin, to consummate his defection from the Catholic priesthood, by forming a matrimonial engagement. The King, as might have been expected, was dissatisfied with his conduct; and, for a time, his interest in religious matters seemed at an end. But Lismaninus, desirous of shewing, that he had not been altogether regardless of the object of his mission, wrote the King an account of his travels; informed him of what had happened since they parted; and, two years after his marriage, sent the books which he had purchased, and forwarded some letters, which the most eminent men in Switzerland had addressed to his Majesty, and of which they had made him the bearer. The contents of these letters were soon noised abroad; and copies of some of them were freely handed about among the Nobles, and created no small sensation.

In May, 1555, the first Synod of the Reformed ever held in Poland, was assembled at Pinczow; and a letter was addressed, in the name of all the Ministers and Nobles, to Lismaninus, who was then residing in Switzerland, inviting him to return. Budzinius was the bearer of this letter, as well as of others, from the King to Gesner, Calvin and Bullinger. Lismaninus wrote back, on the 11th of Nov., that he intended, before he left Switzerland, to pay another visit to the Churches of Bern, Lausanne and Geneva; to observe the form of doctrine, discipline and ceremonies, and the mode of administering the Lord's Supper in each;

and to consult and advise with the Ministers, in order that he might return to his own country, with the advantage to be derived from their knowledge and experience.

At length, in the month of June, 1556, Lismaninus returned to Poland; but he was so obnoxious to the Catholics, that, through their influence, a decree of banishment was issued against him. He lay concealed, for seven weeks, at Ivanovitze, in the house of Agnes Dluski, a noble and pious matron. In the mean time, interest was made for him with the Senators of the kingdom; and he wrote to Tarnovius, who interceded with the King for a reversal of his sentence of banishment. The King was not indisposed to grant the request of Tarnovius; and, in truth, the decree had been issued without his consent, and sealed only with the lesser seal of the kingdom, which was then in the possession of the Catholics. The cause of Lismaninus was taken up by some of the most influential individuals in Poland; and, at length, permission to remain in the country was granted to him, at the particular request of Bonar, Castellan of Biecz, and Cruciger, Superintendent of the Reformed Churches of Little Poland. But, owing to his apparent forgetfulness of the royal favour while in Switzerland, he was never afterwards honoured with the King's confidence.

About the time of his return, a fierce controversy began to rage respecting the real presence; and though much dissatisfaction was expressed at the toleration extended to him, and his opinions, he pursued an active and straightforward course, and ceased not to labour for the diffusion of what he now deemed Christian truth.

In 1558, Blandrata, who was said to entertain the opinion of Servetus concerning the preëminence of God the Father, came to Pinczow, and found there Gonesius, who held the same opinion, and Stancarus, who denied that Christ was

Mediator, as regards his divine nature. A Synod was convened, in the month of November in that year, the object of which was to set at rest these controversies. At this Synod, John a Lasco, Lismaninus, Crovicius, Gregory Pauli, Stanislaüs Sarnicki, Felix Cruciger, and other eminent Divines and Nobles were present. But though the Synod sat several days, and much was said on both sides, no conclusion was arrived at; for both parties retained the opinions, which they brought with them to the discussion. It is remarked, however, by Lubieniecius, that this Synod was a great step towards the demolition of the doctrine of the Trinity.

At a subsequent Synod, held September 16th, 1561, at Cracow, it was objected to Lismaninus, that he had addressed a letter to Iwan Karninski, concerning the pre-eminence of the Father. In this letter, which was written on the 10th of September, Lismaninus opposed the doctrine of Stancarus, and made it his object to prove, by many testimonies from early Christian writers, that the Father is the cause and origin of the Son, and greater than he. Lismaninus addressed a second letter to Karninski, dated Dec. 10th, 1561, in which he defended the same views. This letter is inserted in Lubieniecius's History of the Polish Reformation (L. ii. C. vi. pp. 119—126); and contains various extracts from the writings of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary and Justin Martyr, in which the preëminence of the Father is distinctly admitted. It was dated on the very day appointed for the holding of a Synod at Cracow. At that Synod the letter of Lismaninus was subjected to a rigid examination, and various were the opinions expressed concerning it. But on many minds it produced an impression, unfavourable to the received doctrines, and that impression was never obliterated.

Lubieniecius also mentions (p. 168) “A Cento of Testi-

monies from Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin and Chrysostom," compiled by Lismaninus, for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation of the parties, opposed to each other, on the subject of the Trinity; but he confesses, that he has never been able to obtain a sight of this work.

In 1563, Lismaninus composed "A short Account of the Trinity, in opposition to Stancarus and some others, with a preliminary apologetical Letter, addressed to King Sigismund Augustus." This work was published in 1565; and is alluded to by Andrew Patricius, in a letter to Cardinal Hosius. The letter was dated Grodno, August 17th; but the year in which it was written is not mentioned. It is certain, however, that Lismaninus's tract was forwarded to Patricius in manuscript; for the latter says, in his letter to Hosius, "Francis Lismaninus has sent me a little book, containing his Confession respecting the Trinity, and I send it to your Most Illustrious Lordship, that it may be seen, whether he is to be reckoned among heretics in this article; for he altogether repudiates the appellation of Tritheist." Lismaninus did not long survive the composition of this work; for at Königsberg, where he was living with the Duke of Prussia, he was seized with a kind of fit, to which he had been subject from his youth, and falling into a well, was drowned, as Sandius thinks, (B. A. p. 35,) about the year 1563. Budzinius, who mentions this calamity, says, that he made some inquiries about it; and was told, that the cause of Lismaninus's death was jealousy. Cloppenburg attributes it to the circumstance of his having been vanquished in controversy, or convicted of heresy, and says that he drowned himself. But the probability is, that both these are calumnies.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 34, 35. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* LISMANIN. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 436—438; T. II. pp. 522. 528. 594. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Pol. L. ii. C. iii. iv. vi. L. iii. C. ii. p. 168.

Joh. Stoinii Epitome, etc. pp. 184. 186. *Geo. Schomanni* Testamentum ultimæ Voluntatis, p. 193. *Clopperb.* Theol. Opera, T. II. pp. 325, 326. 328, 329. *Hoornbeek*, Summa Controv. L. vii. p. 566. *Krasinski's* Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. i. pp. 137—142; Chap. v. pp. 275—280.

40.

ANDREW FRICIUS MODREVIUS (*Polonicè*, ANDREAS FRYCZ MODRZEWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, belonging to one of the most illustrious families in the Palatinate of Sandomir. Accounts of him have been written by Lubieniecus, Sandius, Bayle and others. Though he never formally joined any of the denominations of Protestants, he pursued his religious inquiries with the most perfect freedom; and cheerfully allowed to others the liberty which he claimed for himself. In the Preface to one of his works, (*De Mediatore*,) he says, “Our Churches are divided, because no one will make concessions. For my part, I will not hide my talent, how inconsiderable soever it be: but let every man be free; let none imagine my sentiments are oracles, proceeding from the Pythian Apollo; they are only to be considered as the opinions of Frycz, that is, of one man among many.” He had a dislike to everything of the nature of theological subtlety; and was a great admirer of simplicity, both in the forms and doctrines of religion. Lubieniecus speaks of him in the highest possible terms, and says, that his learning would have enabled him to attain to the highest honours in the state; but that he lived on a moderate fortune, content with a knowledge of the truth, which was so hateful to many of the men of that age.

He was born in the year 1506, and received his first religious impressions, when he was in imminent danger of his life. “When he was very young,” says the Rev. Robert Robinson, (*Eccles. Researches*, Chap. xv. p. 606,)

“some affairs called him to Cracow. A young gentleman of his acquaintance accompanied him. They lodged one night at an inn on the road, where the family was all in health, but where they heard the plague was at Cracow. They were obliged to go forward, and having procured all the guardians of health that the medical art afforded, they proceeded on their journey; and though they found the city much worse than they had apprehended, yet they dispatched their business, and returned in perfect health, and with a high opinion of the medical precaution which had preserved them. Journeying on, they arrived late at night at the inn, where they had lodged before. It was cold: they ordered a large fire, supper, and beds. After they had enjoyed themselves two hours, they understood that the mistress of the inn, and two maid servants, had died suddenly of the plague. They were thunderstruck, and thought themselves dead men: but while they were chiding the master for not informing them, and deliberating what to do, a fine child of three months old in perfect health set out a crying in the cradle. ‘This child,’ said one of the servants, ‘lay sucking at the breast of my mistress when she expired.’ This information was life from the dead to the travellers. They took heart, admired providence, which had preserved a babe in such imminent danger, and hoped they should escape unhurt. They did so, but they conversed all the way back on providence, and from thence, by a natural transition, they proceeded to talk of predestination, and thirty years after Modrzewski published a treatise on these subjects, in the preface to which, addressed to his companion, he relates this story, and the deep impressions the affair had made on them both.”

From the age of twenty-eight to thirty-one, he spent his time in Germany, and principally at Wittenberg, in the school of Melancthon, with whom he was a great

favourite. In the course of these three years, however, he seems to have gone once at least to visit his friends in Poland. This was in 1536. The year following, he went to the University of Nuremberg, where he stayed some time, for the purpose of acquiring a knowledge of the German language, and forming an acquaintance with some of the learned men of that place.

He was called an apostate by the Roman Catholics; but this did not prevent Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, who was an earnest inquirer after Christian truth, from conferring upon him the office of his Secretary, consulting him on the most weighty affairs of state, and employing him on various important missions to foreign countries.

Modrevius opposed the celibacy of the clergy, and other objectionable practices, which had obtained the sanction of the Romish Church. Hence, as might have been anticipated, he made himself many bitter enemies among the papal dignitaries, and those who had an interest in upholding things as they were. The Popes, Paul IV. and Pius V., excommunicated him, and urged the Catholic clergy in Poland to denounce, and brand him as a heretic. But he heeded them not; and, in truth, the censures of the Church had then become a mere brutum fulmen in Poland. Orichowski, however, was hired to assail his character, and took advantage of the confidential intercourse which had formerly existed between them, to charge him with heresy, and drag him before an ecclesiastical tribunal. But the attempt to degrade and punish him only issued in Orichowski's own discomfiture.

On one occasion Modrevius was imprisoned, for having publicly attacked the worship of saints, and other vulnerable parts of the Roman Catholic system; but he was soon released, through the influence of powerful friends, and on retiring to Pinczow, induced Olesnicki to open the first

place of worship in Poland, in which the service was conducted upon Protestant principles.

At Königsberg he held a disputation with Osiander on the subject of Christ's mediation; and he visited Hungary and Transylvania, for the purpose of forwarding the progress of the Reformation. But he could not properly be said to belong to any party. "It is not to be doubted," says Bock, (Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 469,) "but Modrevius, who had great influence with the King, and had frequent access to the royal presence, did much to promote the cause of the Antitrinitarians with his sovereign; although he seems to be not improperly reckoned among Academics and Sceptics, who disputed both for and against the Trinity." Ruarus (Ed. Zeltneri, p. 17) assigns him a middle place between the Evangelical party and the Catholics, when treating upon political reform; but regards him as occupying a kind of neutral ground, between professors of the Athanasian Trinity and Unitarians, in his *Sylvæ*. Outwardly, however, he was a Catholic; and from the Catholic body he never avowedly seceded.

He was appointed Secretary of the Legation, commissioned, by the Polish Diet of 1552, to attend the Council of Trent; and on that occasion, the proposals, which he made to the King for reforming the Church, were of the most radical and startling kind. The principles developed in these proposals, if carried out, would have stripped the Pope of all his authority, and rendered him amenable to his own Ministers; but the Council was deferred, and the Legation was never called upon to act.

The talents of Modrevius, however, were not permitted to remain idle. The King, perceiving his aptitude for originating useful reforms in the discipline of the Church, commissioned him to inquire into its doctrines, and particularly that of the Trinity; to ascertain, and report upon

the existing state of the controversy; and to unfold accurately and fully the true opinions of the Antitrinitarians, which were then making great progress in Poland, as well as the arguments, by which those opinions were defended. In issuing this Commission, the King was not only actuated by a desire to obtain information for his own private satisfaction; but anxious to devise some method of composing the differences, which existed among his subjects, on this much agitated question.

Modrevius endeavoured to realize the wishes of his sovereign, by the composition of a work, which he drew up with great care, and entitled "*Sylvæ*." But in carrying out the King's intentions, he met with difficulties of the most formidable and harassing kind. Among others, Jerome Ossolinus, or Ossolinski, a well-known patron of the Evangelical Church, repeatedly urged him to desist from the undertaking, and not to be instrumental in making generally known what had been written on the subject of the Trinity; advice which had been often given before, by Calvin, Peter Martyr, Beza, and other foreign theologians in their letters to the Polish Reformers. This did not prevent Modrevius, however, from prosecuting his inquiries, and embodying the result of them in the work above mentioned. But the consequence was, that he incensed many, and particularly Pope Pius V., whom he thus addresses in the Preface to the 3rd Part of his Work. "I think I shall not be wandering beyond the subject, if I call your attention to these controversies, and dedicate this Book to you, which may afford you an opportunity of settling them, and may, at the same time, commend to you my poor labours, respecting which you seem to have conceived an unfavourable opinion, and therefore to have given orders to those whose business it is to take cognizance of such matters, to spoil me of my possessions, to destroy my

fortunes, and to banish me from house and home, and the society of men. Is this the reward due to merit? Is this a humane act, most holy father?" It appears, from the same Preface, that Modrevius's work was translated into German, French and Spanish; but these versions circulated only in manuscript, and were never published. It was with the greatest difficulty, indeed, that the original was carried through the press. The author tells his readers, in the Preface to the Fourth Sylva, that he had entered into an agreement with John Oporinus, to transmit copies of it, through the booksellers who attended the fair at Frankfort, to some of the most learned men of the time, and to all the Catholic and Protestant Universities throughout Europe: but it appears, from the following distich, in Erasmus Otvinovius's "Lives of Christian Heroes," confirmed by other authorities, that Christopher Trecius, a countryman of Modrevius, twice prevented its being printed, by purloining the manuscript, while it was in the printer's hands.

Rex Augustus jussit, Friez scripsit, Trecius astu,
Sub prælo scripta hæc, bis niger impediit.

Budzinus, in the 36th Book of his manuscript "Commentaries," says, that, after these repeated disappointments, the author recomposed the work from his notes, and enlarged it, by the aid of some Transylvanian books, which had been published in the mean time. In this improved form it was published at Racow, in 4to., July, 1590.

The following are the subjects upon which it treats. *Sylva I.* On the three persons and one essence of God; dedicated to Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland. This was written in December, 1565. *Sylva II.* On the necessity of holding a council for settling religious controversies. This also was dedicated to Sigismund Augustus, and bears the same date as the preceding one. *Sylva III.* On Jesus Christ, the Son of God and man, and our Lord and God:

dedicated to Pope Pius V., and written in the month of June, 1568. *Sylva IV.* On the word *Homousius*, and its adjuncts; dedicated to James Uchanski, Archbishop of Gnezno, papal Legate, and Primate of the kingdom of Poland. This was written in the month of June, 1569. To these was added, An Examination of the Question concerning the Union of the divine and human Nature in the Person of Christ.

This work, which is now exceedingly rare, is of great importance in the history of modern Unitarianism. There is a copy of it in the Archiëpiscopal Library at Lambeth. Bock also met with a copy, which had formerly passed through the hands of Faustus Socinus, and Michael Gittichius, both of whom had marked the passages, which they conceived to be most deserving of notice, and occasionally added marginal notes of their own. Socinus's opinion of it is expressed in a letter to a friend, written less than a year after its publication. In this letter he says, "I hope you have received Fricius's book, or will receive it very soon, for it is an excellent work; but it should be read, as I am fully persuaded that you will read it, with the greatest discrimination; and I hope that, by a perusal either of this book, or of others, you may attain to a perfect knowledge of the truth." The opinions of Modrevius, as may be inferred from this passage, though not precisely the same as those of Socinus, were not very dissimilar from them. Count Krasinski, speaking of the "*Sylvæ*," says, "It savours strongly of a philosophical indifference about the principal dogmas of the Christian religion, an indifference which seems to have been shared by his royal master, and which accounts for the vacillating conduct which Sigismund Augustus held in respect to the religious parties which agitated his dominions." (Historical Sketch, &c. Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. iii. p. 201.)

Modrevius seems to be not improperly reckoned by Bock among the number of Antitrinitarians. Cloppenburg describes the “Sylvæ” as openly Antitrinitarian (Theolog. Opera Omnia, T. II. p. 329); but says, that its author, in a letter addressed to Lismaninus, and dated March 26th, 1563, wished to have it thought, that he approved of an orthodox Confession of Faith concerning the Trinity. It is fair to presume, therefore, that Modrevius’s opinion upon this subject changed, between that time and the composition of the “Sylvæ.” It appears, however, from his own account of a conversation, which he had with Spiritus, about the year 1546, and which will be more particularly noticed in the next article, that an impression, unfavourable to the doctrine of the Trinity, was made upon his mind at that time, which was never afterwards effaced; and which pre-disposed him to listen to what was said in opposition to it, when the subject was again brought before him, during the preparation of his “Sylvæ.”

The principal works of Modrevius, next to the “Sylvæ,” are the following.

1. Four Orations, On Homicide.
2. On the Laity’s partaking of the Communion of both Kinds. Prague, 1549.
3. A Disputation on 1 Cor. vii. 1. 1551.
4. On the Reformation of the Republic, in Five Books; namely, 1. On Morals; 2. On Laws; 3. On War; 4. On the Church; 5. On the School. The last of these Books, which is not found in the Cracow edition, published in 1551, is decidedly of an Anti-Roman character. Other editions, containing that Book, were afterwards published at Basle, in 1554 and 1559; and the work was translated into French, German and Spanish.
5. A second Book, On the Church, written in an ironical style, and dedicated to Pope Paul IV.

6. A Speech on the Legates to be sent to a Christian Council; dedicated to John Tarnovius, to whom the author acknowledges his obligation, for affording him an asylum in time of persecution. 8vo. This is the most Anti-Roman of all Modrevius's works, and excited unusual anger in the Catholic party.

7. A Treatise against the Enactment of 1543, which gave exclusively to the Nobles the right of possessing landed property.

8. Three Books on the Mediatorial Office of Christ. In this, which was written in 1560, and dedicated to the reformed Synods of Vlodislav and Xionx, and to the two Protestant Grandees, Stanislaus Stadnicki and Jerome Ossolinski, there is said to be an evident leaning to the opinion of Stancarus. It was published in 4to., 1562, at the end of

9. Three Books: 1. On Original Sin; 2. On Free Will; 3. On Predestination. A. D. 1562, 4to.

10. Prudent Advice on making War against Infidels. This work was translated out of Latin into Spanish by John Justiniani of Padua, who sent a manuscript copy of his translation to the King of England, which is now in the Archiëpiscopal Library at Lambeth. Bock also speaks of a manuscript copy of this translation, as being in the Imperial Library at Vienna.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 35—38. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* MODREVIUS. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 466—496. *Robinson's* Ecclesiastical Researches, Camb. 1792, 4to. l. c. *Cloppenb.* Theol. Opera, T. II. p. 329. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. i. C. v. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 46. *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 210. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. iii. pp. 199—204; Chap. iv. pp. 218—233; Chap. viii. p. 363.

41.

ADAM PASTORIS, a native of Holland, according to some, but according to others, a Westphalian, originally belonged to the Anabaptists of Friesland, from whose society he was

excluded, about the year 1546, or 1547, on account of his heterodox sentiments concerning the Trinity.

Bock says, that he began to be publicly known, about the year 1546; but that his mind appears to have been previously infected with error. Bullinger relates, that a sect sprang from him about that time; that he held a disputation with Theodore Philipps, at the town of Goch, in the Duchy of Cleves, on the Divinity of Christ; and that Menno Simonis, and his followers, after inveighing against the doctrines which he held on this subject, pronounced sentence of excommunication against him. He is said to have rested the defence of his opinions chiefly on John xvii. 3, and xiv. 28.

Brandt, alluding to the early quarrels which arose among the Anabaptists, says, "the first was in the year 1547, between Menno and Richard Philipps on the one side, and Francis Kuper and Adam Pastoris on the other. There were two private consultations," he adds, "between Menno and his friends thereupon: the first was holden at Emden, the second at Goch. Pastoris leaned to the opinions of the Ariens, for which he was excommunicated by Richard Philipps; and Kuper, who relapsed to Popery, was excommunicated by Menno." (*Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries*, Bk. iv. A. D. 1555.)

Pastoris appears to have adopted, at different periods of his life, the feigned names of Rudolph Martin and Spiritus, probably with a view to his personal safety; since it was dangerous, in those times, to make an open profession of sentiments, at variance with the established creed. Andrew Wissowatius, in the Appendix to his "*Narratio Compendiosa*," says, "Who that Spiritus, the Dutchman, was, whence he came, and what befel him, the forementioned authors do not state. I suspect that Adam Pastoris lay concealed under that name." (P. 217.) After his expulsion from the

Anabaptist party, Adam Pastoris is supposed to have taken up his residence, for a time, in Poland; and to have been known there, under the assumed name of *Spiritus*.

Concerning this *Spiritus*, the following particulars were given by Modrevius, in the first Book of his "*Sylvæ*." (Tract. ii. Cap. ii.)

"There had come to Cracow, in the year of Christ 1546, if my memory does not deceive me, a Dutchman, well versed, as it appeared, in the Scriptures, and peculiarly apt in making quotations from them. When he had been a few days as a stranger at Cracow, he was invited to a party, by a gentleman of distinction, whose guest I happened at the same time to be. Before dinner we were introduced into the library of our host, which was well supplied with books of all kinds; and while every one (for we were not a few) was amusing himself with the books most to his own taste, *Spiritus* (for that was the Dutchman's name) happened to lay his hands upon a small Book of Prayers for Christians, in which he found distinct addresses to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. 'What! gentlemen,' said he, addressing himself to us; 'Have you three Gods?' When we told him, that we had but one God, who *had* three persons in one essence, he said, 'What *has*, and what *is had*, are different. He, who *has* the three, is different from the three, who *are had* by him.' We then said, 'You are playing the sophist, *Spiritus*. Our simple confession is, that God is one in essence, but in persons three.' 'Yours, then,' said he, 'is a tri-une God.' 'Just so,' said we; 'but three in one respect, and one in another.' 'If, then,' he observed, 'he is three in one, why do you address them by separate prayers? and why, in these prayers, do you ask them to confer separate benefits on the race of mortals?' Such was the nature of the conversation, which at that time

passed between us ; for as we believed that no subject was more thoroughly settled than this, and were religiously forbidden to sow contentions respecting it, we turned the conversation into a different channel. But when I came afterwards to turn the matter over in my mind, I secretly wondered, how it could be, that, as all the external acts of the persons were thought to be undivided, we addressed them by different prayers ; offering one prayer to the Father, another to the Son, and a third to the Holy Ghost, and afterwards imploring the aid of the Trinity in a distinct prayer ; just as if any one should make so many distinct requests to Peter, Paul, Andrew, James, and Philip, and then, in one prayer, seek aid from all the Apostles, of whom, as the persons are distinct, so are the essences. In the prayer-books in common use we meet with distinct addresses of this kind to the three persons."

Budzinius, who gave an account of the above conversation, in his manuscript "Commentaries," (C. iv.) says, that it took place in the library of John Tricesius ; and enumerates, as among the guests, Andrew Fricius Modrevius, Bernard Wojewodka, and James Prilusius, all of whom were members of the secret society, to which allusion was made, in the account of Francis Lismaninus. Budzinius added, that, at the words of Spiritus, there was a dead silence, and as soon as the subject of conversation was changed, dinner was announced ; but that there were those present, upon whom what had passed made a deep impression, and who, noting what they had heard, took home with them this question, which in their own time was to become the chief subject of discussion in Poland.

Zeltner conjectured, that Everhard, the father of John and Peter Geisteranus, was the Spiritus of Modrevius and Budzinius (Not. ad Ruari Epistolas, p. 503) ; but in this conjecture he stands alone. The supposition of Andrew

Wissowatius, (Narratio Compend. App. p. 217,) that this was one of the assumed names of the subject of the present article, is the one now generally received.

Adam Pastoris was a strenuous opponent of Infant Baptism. He admitted the preëxistence of Christ; but denied his coëternity and consubstantiality with the Father, whom he maintained to be the only true God. His sentiments concerning the Holy Spirit were similar to those of the Unitarians of the present day, who deny its personality, and contend, that it is nothing but the power and energy of God. Sandius collected from his writings, that he defended his opinion concerning the person of Christ, and the Word, from the introduction to John's Gospel.

He died at Emden; but the exact time of his death is not known. The following is a catalogue of his writings.

1. The Difference between the true and false Doctrine of the Articles in Dispute. This was without either date, or printer's name; and Sandius describes it as of the 8vo. size, and in the Saxon language. Of the subjects discussed in it the same writer has given the heads. (B. A. pp. 39, 40.)

2. A Disputation concerning the Godhead of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which Adam Pastoris and his followers held at Lubeck, both orally and in writing, against Menno Simonis and his followers, in the year 1552. In the course of this disputation, Adam Pastoris maintained the same opinions, which he had done five years before, against Theodore and Menno. The disputation was written in Saxon.

3. A Disputation with Dirk [Theodore] Philipps, in the same language.

4. A Treatise, On the Mercy of God.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 38—40, *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 589—591; T. II. pp. 277, 278. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about

the Low Countries. Lond. 1720, Fol. Vol. I. p. 104. *And. Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. App. pp. 216, 217. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. i. C. v. pp. 18—20. *A. F. Modrevii* Sylvæ, l. c. *Ruari* Epist. Zeltn. Ed. l. c. Apocalypsis, pp. 74—76. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Chap. xv. p. 560.

42.

ALFONSO LINGURIUS immediately follows *Adam Pastoris* in Sandius's Catalogue of Antitrinitarian authors. He was a countryman, and probably a friend of Servetus, having been born at Tarragona, in Spain. We know nothing further, however, of his personal history. But we learn, from the Preface to a work which he left behind him, what Servetus contemplated, and what he would in all probability have accomplished, if his life had not been suddenly cut short by a cruel martyrdom. "Servetus," says he, "having suffered much in France and Germany, intended to have gone to Venice, to publish a Commentary upon the whole of the Old Testament, had he not been burnt, on his way, at Geneva. He was about to publish several discourses, if I am not mistaken, under the following titles. 'On the proper Understanding of the Scriptures; On the Origin of the Defection from the Apostolic Doctrine; On the Power of Truth; On the true Knowledge of the One God; On the Error of the Trinity; On the Word and the Holy Spirit; On the Exaltation of the Man Jesus; On the Nature and Ministry of Angels; On Zeal and Knowledge; On the Efficacy of Faith; On the Power of Charity; On Body, Soul and Spirit; On those who are born, and those who are born again; On Man's Calling and Election; On Prescience and Predestination; on human Works, and Ceremonies; On the Baptism of Water and the Spirit; On the Lord's Supper; On Sin and Satisfaction; On Justification; On the Fear and Love of God; On the true Church; On the Head and Members; On the Sleep of the Saints; On the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Change

of the Living ; On the Day of Judgment ; On the Blessedness of the Elect,' &c. It would have been interesting to know, what Servetus had to say upon many of these subjects ; but Alfonso has merely enumerated their titles, a knowledge of which he had probably obtained from Servetus himself.

The Ministers of Poland and Transylvania, in a short notice of the subject of this article, say, "What has not Alfonso of Tarragona attempted, who, in his 'Five Books on the One God, and his only Son,' has some excellent observations, directed against the tyranny and pride of those Aristarchuses, who teach the commonly received doctrine?"

The name *Alfonso*, which has for ages been a common one in Spain, occurs frequently in M'Crie's History of the Reformation in that country ; but we look in vain for that of *Alfonso Lingurius*, or *Alfonso of Tarragona*. It is deeply to be regretted, indeed, that so little has survived respecting him, and other eminent Spanish reformers, of whom the name alone, and in some cases scarcely even that, has been left upon record ; although Spain, at one time, promised to take a leading part in the great Protestant movement of the sixteenth century.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 15. 40. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. pp. 320, 321. 382, 383.

43.

LUDOVICO FIERI was a Bolognese, and member of the Protestant Church at Chiavenna. Having attacked the Divinity of Christ, he was summoned before the Synod of Coire, in 1561, together with Girolamo Turriano, of Plurs, and Michael Angelo Florio, Minister of Soglio, who had denied the doctrine of the Atonement, and asserted, that salvation originates in the Free Grace of God alone.

Certain articles, condemnatory of their opinions, were drawn up, and presented to them for their signature. Florio and Turriano subscribed; but Fieri, declining to do so, was excommunicated, and retired into Moravia. On being interrogated, (whether in his own name only, or in that of the party with which he acted, does not appear,) he answered openly and intrepidly, that he agreed in all things, except three, with the Church at Chiavenna; and that these three things were, the eternal sonship of Jesus Christ, his equality with the Father, and the creation of heaven and earth by him. The Ministers present are said to have been struck with amazement, when they heard these declarations; but Fieri remained unmoved, and proposed, in the name of himself and his friends, as a fit subject of deliberation for the Synod, "Whether any one ought to be deemed a heretic, on account of a simple error in the article of the Trinity, when, in other respects, he is a man of approved morals, and distinguished for his charity to the poor?" After he had been some time in Moravia, he returned to Chiavenna; and was more zealous than ever for the diffusion of Antitrinitarian opinions.

Scipio Lentulus, Pastor of Chiavenna, to whom we are indebted for a knowledge of this last fact, in the same letter, dated Nov. 7th, 1569, and inserted by De Porta, in his *Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt.*, (T. I. L. ii. p. 497,) mentions a heterodox blacksmith, of the name of SOLOMON, who resided at Plurs, and had been excommunicated about ten years before, for asserting, that Jesus Christ was God, only in as far as he was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and was not God equal with the Father, and joint Creator with him of heaven and earth. This man is described as still persisting in these opinions, and continuing to maintain them on all occasions, in public as well as in private. In the same letter, mention is also made of one FRANCESCO

OF BAGNA-CAVALLO, a wealthy town of Romagna, who was once orthodox in his opinions ; but who, after a short absence from Chiavenna, returned to that place, and asserted that Christ was not God by nature, but by appointment.

VIDEND. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Ræt. T. I. L. ii. C. xiv. pp. 395, 396 ; C. xix. pp. 497, 498. *M'Crie's Hist. of the Ref. in Italy*, Chap. vi. p. 414.

44.

PETER GONESIUS, (*Polon.* GONIÖNDZKI, or GONIADZKI, and the CONYZA of Bock,) was probably a native of the little town of Goniondz, or Goniadz, in the province of Podlachia. He was an alumnus of the University of Cracow ; but was enabled, by the aid of his Catholic friends, and more particularly by the liberal patronage of Paul Algi-mont, Bishop of Wilna, to prosecute his studies in foreign Universities, and among others in that of Wittenberg. As long as he remained in Germany, he is said to have resisted the Protestant influences, to which he was exposed ; but when he passed over into Switzerland, he ceased to be a Catholic, and embraced those Antitrinitarian views, which were so prevalent among the Italian exiles, who had sought refuge in that country, and which, on his return into Poland, he openly propagated and defended.

Bock thinks it probable, that Melanchthon, in an epistle to Sturmius, written in 1535, points to Gonesius, who must, as we are told, have left Wittenberg in that year. (*Hist. Ant.* T. II. p. 291.) He says, in another place, (T. I. p. 107,) that Gonesius, applying himself assiduously to his studies in Switzerland, chanced to meet with the books of Servetus, and seems to have been first corrupted by them ; adding, that Melanchthon complains of his having brought with him to Wittenberg a voluminous work, “ *De Communicatione (Idiomatum), nec dialectica, nec physica, ideoque prorsus nulla,*” and of his having dis-

seminated there the same hypotheses, impugning the Divinity of Christ, as John Campanus had done about seven years before.

Gonesius was the first among the Polish Reformers, who ventured to attack the doctrine of the Trinity in a public assembly. Unitarianism had been before diffused principally by means of conversation, and discussions of a more private kind. But in the month of January, 1556, at a Synod of the Reformed clergy, held at Secemin, he asserted the supremacy of the Father, and contended that the Apostles' Creed ought to be received as the only Rule of Faith among Christians, at the same time describing the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds as compositions of no authority, and maintaining, that the doctrines which they taught were at variance with those taught in the Scriptures. In the course of his address, he expressed the great pleasure, which he had in meeting his brethren and friends in Christ, in so venerable an assembly of the faithful, after the difficulties and perils which he had encountered in foreign countries; and expressed his gratitude to the great Father of all, for having preserved *them* at home, and mercifully protected *him* on his journey. He alluded to the fact of his having been sent abroad, some years before, by the Catholics of Zeiden, to improve himself; and told his audience how he was converted to the Protestant faith, and with what care he had weighed and sifted all that he heard throughout Germany and Switzerland, but more especially at Wittenberg and Geneva. Then, after reviewing the steps, by which error first made its way into the primitive Church, and shewing how doctrines were retained among Christians, which had been the growth of later ages, he concluded in words to this effect. "As becomes an honest man, I do not conceal from you, that, in my opinion, the Father only is the true God, as Christ

himself, his messenger, teaches; that he is greater than the Son; that the one God, the God of Israel, is the Creator of all things; that Christ received all things from him, and is indeed the Son, but also God; especially as I still believe, that the Logos, which was in the beginning, was converted into flesh in the womb of the Virgin, and that the Word thus became flesh, and was God; but yet truly and properly died, and always ascribed honour to the Father; was raised from the dead, and glorified by him; and therefore rendered up to him all that he had received. I further believe, that the Trinity, Consubstantiality, Circumincession, and other things introduced into the Church from the Schools, are figments of the human brain, and therefore ought to be discarded, so that we may appeal to the Scriptures alone as the certain rule of faith. In a word, I was baptized, as we all were, into the Apostles' Creed: I abide by that, and that alone; and firmly believe that the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are unnecessary. All that I have said, however, I submit, together with myself, to your judgment and examination; and I humbly pray, that God, the Father of lights, the Father of mercy, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, may be present, by his Holy Spirit, in this assembly, and prosper your pious undertakings."

This address is said to have produced a powerful effect; but those who heard it were not prepared to receive, with unqualified approbation, all the propositions which Gonesius advanced. It was therefore agreed, that the subject should be reconsidered at some future meeting; and, in the mean time, that the opinion of Melanchthon should be obtained respecting the disputed points. A letter was accordingly addressed to Melanchthon, and Gonesius was charged with its safe delivery. In that letter, it was said, that Gonesius "believed the Logos to be inferior to the

Father as touching his godhead; that the divine was converted into the human nature; and that God properly died;”—which was what experienced Theologians would denounce, as a combination of the Arian, Eutychian, and Patripassian heresies. But no candid person will wonder, that Gonesius, in struggling to free himself from the trammels of error, should not express himself with strict theological accuracy. He found the Churches in a state of approximation only towards the pure truth; the light of which dawned but gradually and slowly upon his own mind. The opinions, which he expressed in 1556, were happily not final; and, as time advanced, the Polish Antitrinitarians saw their way more clearly, than when they first emerged from the shades of Popish darkness.

The opinion concerning the supremacy of the Father made no small progress during the next three years; and on the 15th of December, 1558, Gonesius again stood forward at the Synod of Brzesc, and openly professed that opinion. On the same occasion, he produced a paper, which he had drawn up against Infant Baptism; and in which he endeavoured to shew, that this rite is accordant neither with Scripture, primitive antiquity, nor sound reason. This paper being publicly read, gave offence to the greater part of the assembly. The only person present, who defended the opinions advanced by Gonesius, was Jerome Piekarski (*vide Art.* 107); and although he was enjoined to keep silence on pain of excommunication, he made a long and able speech, in which he recapitulated what Gonesius had said concerning the Unity of God, and entered into a powerful defence of his friend's views on the subject of Baptism. The Synod, in order to avoid a schism among the Reformed party, imposed silence on Gonesius, but without effect; for he not only continued to broach his opinions, but found many, who were ready

to second him, in asserting and maintaining them. His most active patron was John Kiszka, General of Lithuania, and Starost of Samogitia, who appointed him Minister of Wengrow; and was instrumental in establishing other Churches on Unitarian principles.

Gonesius maintained, that it is unlawful for a Christian to exercise the office of a Magistrate, or to bear arms; and by way of practically asserting the latter of these opinions, which Budzinius says that he derived from the Moravian Brethren, he wore a wooden sword, when he returned to his own country. Many afterwards embraced the same opinions, and strenuously defended them. It is further said of him, on the authority of Budzinius, that he wrote against the Racovians, who denied that the Son of God existed before his mother. His favourite author was Irenæus, whom he preferred to all later controversial writers.

One of the earliest works of Gonesius, probably the very first that he composed, was entitled, “De Communicatione (Idiomatum) nec dialectica, nec physica, ideoque prorsus nulla.” The object of this work was to shew, as the title indicates, that the “communication of forms or properties,” said to arise from the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, is “neither a logical nor a physical one, and therefore no communication at all.” This is described as a work of great magnitude; and the author is said to have taken it with him to Wittenberg, during the life of Melancthon. Arminius contended that “such communication was *not real*, (as though some things which are proper to the divine nature were effused into the human nature,) but *verbal*: yet” that “it rested on the truth of this union, and intimated the closest conjunction of both the natures.” (The Works of James Arminius, D. D., translated by James Nichols, Vol. II. p. 380.) To such trifling and unintelligible distinctions are the wisest men

driven, when tied down to the use of scholastic phraseology!

Gonesius attacked Pædobaptism, and defended his own views on the subject, in two works, published in the years 1558 and 1562. The former was publicly read at the Synod of Brzesc; and the latter was addressed to Laurence Criscovius. He also wrote a Latin treatise against the Divinity of the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit; and another entitled, “The pure and clear Doctrine on the Principal Points of the Christian Religion, against the impious and perplexed Sophisms of the Sabellians, Ebionites, Nestorians and other Heretics, collected from the pure Word of God;” published about the year 1562. Jerome Zanchius, in his reply to this, calls Gonesius a Tritheist and Eutychian; charges him with teaching, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three Gods, yet so that the Father alone is the true God, to the exclusion of the Son and the Holy Spirit; and represents him as confounding, with Eutyches, the two natures of Christ. The following are the titles of three other of Gonesius’s works, all of them published in the year 1570, in 8vo., and in the Polish language.

1. On the Son of God; intended to prove, in opposition to the opinions of the Ebionites, that he existed before the creation of the world, and that all things were made by him:

2. On Christian Baptism, as opposed to modern Baptism:—and

3. On the Three, that is, God, his Son, and the Holy Spirit, against the Trinity of the Sabellians.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 40—42. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 106—110; T. II. p. 291. *Stoinii* Epitome, pp. 183—185. *And*, *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 211. *Lubieniceii* Hist. Ref. Polon L. ii. C. vi. viii. *Krasinski’s* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. viii. pp. 346—348.

45.

STANISLAÛS LUTOMIRSCIUS, (*Polon.* LUTOMIRSKI,) a Polish Knight of an illustrious family, and Secretary to Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, was originally a Catholic Priest, and had the joint cures of Commin and Tussin. According to Sandius, he was designated Archbishop of Gnezno; but whether there was ever any real intention of elevating him to that dignity, seems doubtful. About the year 1544, he adopted the Helvetic Confession; and some years afterwards was appointed to succeed Felix Cruciger, as Superintendent of the Churches of Little Poland.

He was cited, by the Archbishop of Gnezno, to Lowicz, in 1555, on a charge of heresy; and took with him a copy of the Bible, and a large company of his neighbours. Being thus prepared for the apprehended contest, the Archbishop thought it most prudent to drop the proceedings instituted against him, and allow him to return unmolested. When he got home, he committed to writing, in the Polish language, a Confession of his Faith, which was printed at Königsberg, in 1556, 4to. Prefixed to it were two Epistles, one addressed to the King, the other to the Archbishop of Gnezno. This Confession contained nothing at variance with the orthodox creed, on the subject of the Trinity. Yet Lutomirscius was one of the first of those, who prepared the way for the controversy respecting the Trinity, which afterwards agitated the kingdom of Poland; and did not hesitate to attach himself to the party of Gregory Pauli, when that intrepid champion of the Unitarian cause began to broach his opinion concerning the Supremacy of the Father.

John Stoinius, or Stoinski, in his “*Epitome Historiæ Originis Unitariorum in Polonia*,” says, (p. 185,) that Lutomirscius was appointed Superintendent of the Churches of Little Poland, by the nineteenth Synod, held at Pinczow,

January 30th, 1561. Before this time he had only been thought to be a *Pinczovian*; but at the Conference held at Petricow, in 1562, he went over completely to the Antitrinitarian party.

Here it may be desirable to explain what is meant by a *Pinczovian*; and, as other designations of the Antitrinitarian body will be found in different parts of this work, the following explanatory remarks, from the pen of Dr. Thomas Rees, (*Racovian Catechism*; *Hist. Introd.* p. xxviii.) may assist the reader in ascertaining the precise meaning of those designations, and may prevent him from confounding them one with the other. "Though these Antitrinitarian reformers have been occasionally styled UNITARIANS in the preceding narrative, in conformity with modern usage, it must be observed that they were not known by this designation in Poland. At the period now under review, they were called by various denominations, arising chiefly from local or temporary circumstances. They were first distinguished by the name of PINCZOVIANs, from the town of Pinczow, where they had their earliest settlement. Some of the body were afterwards called FARNOVIANs, from Stanislaüs Farnovius, who held the Arian doctrine concerning the person of Christ." (*Vide Art. 62.*) "Others were styled BUDNÆANs, from Simon Budnæus, who maintained the opinion of the simple humanity of Christ, and denied his being a proper object of religious worship." (*Vide Art. 76.*) "But the designation by which they were afterwards most generally known was that of RACOVIANs, from the town of Racow, which for several years formed their metropolis." (*Vide Art. 148.*)

On the 17th of May, 1563, at the Synod of Cracow, Lutomirscius wrote a letter to certain Nobles and Brethren, in which he endeavoured to avert the schism, which Stanislaüs Sarniecki was attempting to promote; and vindicated

Gregory Pauli from the charges brought against him. This letter was signed by twenty-three Elders and Ministers besides himself; and is inserted entire in Lubieniecious's "History of the Polish Reformation" (pp. 161—164). On the 20th of May, in the same year, he addressed another letter on the same subject to the Ministers and Brethren of Lithuania and Podlachia, which Lubieniecious has likewise incorporated into his "History" (pp. 164—166). He also took a deep interest in the controversy, which had recently sprung up, on the subject of Baptism; and in the month of June, 1565, wrote a letter, in the name of the Synod of Brzest, in Cujavia, to the Church of the brethren at Wilna, in reference to the dispute, which had arisen between Martin Czechovicius and others. On the 30th of December, in the same year, he also drew up the "Conclusion of the Synod of Wengrow;" and signed it as Superintendent, with the consent of the Synod. Both these documents have been transferred to Lubieniecious's "History," from the manuscript "Commentaries" of Stanislaus Budzinius. (Lubien. Hist. Ref. Pol. pp. 177—179. 180—184.) On the 23rd of July, 1566, he addressed a letter to Martin Czechovicius and his friends, inviting them to a Synod at Brzeziny, at which it was proposed to discuss the doctrines of the preëxistence of Christ, and the union of the divine and human natures in his person; but this Synod, as Sandius informs us, (B. A. p. 43,) was afterwards put off for certain reasons. In 1574, he drew up a statement of his own opinion respecting the lawfulness of a Christian's bearing arms, and acting in the capacity of a Magistrate; two questions, which, in those times, excited much discussion. Bock thinks, that this statement was directed against Gregory Pauli, or Martin Czechovicius, whom Budnæus and Budzinius opposed in their writings. In the same year Lutomirscius wrote a letter on

the subject of Baptism, in reply to one from Nicholas Paruta. In this letter he advocates the celebration of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; but admits that the time and mode of celebration should be left to the discretion of different Churches. He recommends the avoidance of all superstition; and hopes that whatever is done may tend to edification, peace and tranquillity.

Gerdesius produces a letter, addressed by Lutomirscius to John Utenhoven, dated 1560, and three others to the Reformed Churches of Cracow and Wilna; the first of which was addressed, in 1563, to the Brethren assembled at Cracow; the second, in the same year, to the Brethren at Wilna; and the third, in 1565, to the Church at Wilna.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 42, 43. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 459—463. *Stoinii* Epitome, l. c. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. i. pp. 161—167; C. iii. pp. 177—184.

46.

GREGORY PAULI, of Brzeziny, though of Italian extraction, was born in Poland. He is often called, by Stancarus and others, the Massovite. In 1552, Justus Decius, Secretary to the King, established a Reformed Church on his estate, called Vola, in the immediate vicinity of Cracow; and of this Church Pauli was appointed Minister. In the Synodical Acts for 1556, he is styled the Pastor of Pelsnick, which was also in the neighbourhood of Cracow.

“It was by slow and wary steps,” says the Rev. Robert Robinson, “that the Reformed approached Cracow, the metropolis of the whole kingdom, and the residence of the fierce Bishop Zebridowsky. They first procured two parish Churches in villages near the city, and placed the pious and learned Gregory Pauli to preach there, and the citizens went in crowds to hear him. Soon after Lasocki, Stradnizki, and other Noblemen, brought Reformed Ministers to

preach in their houses, and the Castellan Bonar, Governour of the castle of Cracow, not only caused sermons to be preached in his own house, but in a spacious area of his garden near the walls of the city. Here Pauli often preached, and multitudes resorted thither to hear him. The clergy revenged themselves by refusing to sit down with them while they were alive, or to bury them after they were dead. This did not much affect them, for the Lord of Chelmski gave them a piece of ground three miles from the city to bury in, that they might not be obliged to submit to the papal service on that occasion. The Catholics called this 'Dogs'-Hill,' for they thought to be buried without the ceremonies of the Church was to be buried like a dog: but the Protestants persevered in their practice."

Gregory Pauli was no less celebrated for his great talents, than his varied and extensive learning; and became a bold defender of the Unity and Supremacy of the Father. He appears to have cherished sentiments at variance with the orthodox creed, some time before he openly asserted and maintained them; but, on the conversion of Francis Lismaninus, he threw off the disguise which he had previously assumed, and united with him in attacking the common opinions, respecting the nature of God, and the person and offices of Christ. He first avowed his Antitrinitarian sentiments at the Synod of Secemin, held January 24th, 1556. On this account he was charged with heresy at the Synod of Pinczow: but this did not intimidate, or silence him. He made no secret of his Unitarianism; and openly avowed it from the pulpit.

He rejected the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, and that of the first five Œcumenical Councils. He condemned the baptism of infants; advocated a community of goods; contended that a Christian should neither accept civil offices,

nor bear arms; and believed in a millennium, of which he expected to see the speedy arrival. It is said that he was first instructed in the principles of Arianism by Peter Gonesius: but if it were so, he soon abandoned the doctrine of Christ's preëxistence, and publicly maintained, that his existence commenced with his birth into this world.

These opinions were strenuously combated by the orthodox party, and especially by Stanislaüs Sarnicki, a violent Calvinistic Minister, and one of the most dangerous men in Poland. But they met with zealous and powerful advocates in other quarters; and Pauli himself found a munificent patron in Stanislaüs Cichovius, Arch-chamberlain of Cracow, and afterwards Castellan of Biecz, and a General in the army.

A vacancy occurring in Trinity Church, at Cracow, Cichovius, the patron of that Church, placed Pauli there; and the citizens crowded to hear his sermons. Sarnicki had expected this preferment for himself; and when he found that it was given to another, and particularly to an Antitrinitarian, his resentment knew no bounds, and he became a more violent adversary of the liberal party than ever.

Sandius states, that, while Pauli was preaching against the doctrine of the Trinity, about mid-day on Trinity Sunday, 1562, the ball at the top of Trinity Church was struck with lightning, and thrown to the ground. This was construed, by the more zealous Antitrinitarians, into a favourable omen; while many of the other party regarded it as a token of the divine displeasure. Some said, that the blow was meant to strike terror to the heart of the Preacher; but others said, that it was intended to impart new courage to him. The wiser and more reflecting portion of the community were silent.

During the controversy respecting the Trinity, which raged with unabated violence in Poland soon after the open declaration of his opinions by Gregory Pauli, he, with the approbation of several persons of rank and dignity, attempted to restore the peace of the Church, by a friendly Conference between the heads of the contending parties; but the dispute was conducted with so much violence by the orthodox, that the assembly was abruptly dissolved, and a resolution was passed by the Trinitarians, that no future Conference should be held with their Unitarian opponents on these subjects. This event led to a separation; and the Reformed Church was, from that time, divided into two parties, called the Greater and the Lesser Church, the former adhering to the prevailing sentiments respecting the Trinity, and the latter contending for the sole and undivided Supremacy of the Father.

In July, 1562, a Synod was held at Rogow, for the purpose of reconciling the two parties; and in the month of August another was held at Pinczow, having the same object in view. At the former there was a manifest leaning towards the doctrines of Pauli, and at the latter his adherents were in an actual majority; but the inflexible Sarnicki refused to bow to its decisions. Another was afterwards summoned for the 4th of November, at which it was proposed, that the Helvetic Confession should be signed; but that every one should be at liberty to interpret it in his own way. The proposition, however, was rejected; and at the Conference of Petricow, held in the same year, the Antitrinitarian party solemnly rejected, as unscriptural, the doctrine of the Trinity, under the guidance of their Ministers, Gregory Pauli, Stanislaüs Lutomirscius, Martin Crovicius, Stanislaüs Paclesius, and George Schomann, and of several Nobles, among whom were John Niemojewius, Jerome Philipovius and John Cazanovius.

On the 14th of May, 1563, at the suggestion of Sarnicki, a Synod was convened, consisting exclusively of the Calvinistic party, and supported by Bonar, Castellan of Biecz; Myscovich, or Myskowsky, Palatine of Cracow; Firley, Palatine of Lublin; and other patrons. This Synod condemned the doctrines of the Antitrinitarians in the most unqualified terms, and compelled Pauli to resign his office, as Minister of Cracow. A few days afterwards, the defeated Antitrinitarian party convoked a Synod of its own at Cracow, over which Lutomirscius presided. It consisted of twenty Ministers, and three lay patrons, who passed resolutions, declaring the proceedings of the former Synod null and void. The Antitrinitarians were now generally known by the name of *Pinczovians*; and their doctrines spread rapidly among persons of all classes, particularly those of the higher ranks, including Magistrates, Nobles, Knights, Governors, Palatines, Officers of the Crown, Ministers, and Rectors of the Schools in Great and Little Poland, Lithuania, Russia, Podolia, Volhynia, Prussia, Silesia and Transylvania.

The King of Poland, desirous of seeing his subjects live in harmony with each other, acceded to a proposal, made to him by Philipovius, to call a Synod at Petricow, where both sides might be heard by Judges, chosen indifferently from the two parties, and their disputes might be finally adjusted. Accordingly, on the opening of the Diet of 1565, he issued an ordinance, that such a Conference should take place; and it was held at Petricow in the year following. Of this memorable Conference the Rev. Robert Robinson, in his Ecclesiastical Researches, gives the annexed description.

“On the appointed day the delegates of both parties met. On the side of the Pinczovians were Nicholas Sienicki, President of the Lower House of the Diet, usually called

the Demosthenes of Poland; the Castellan John Lutomirski, a member of the Upper House; Philipowski, the Receiver-General of the district of Cracow; and John Niemojewius, member for Inowladislaus. This last gentleman had been of the long robe, and Judge of that district which he now represented in the Diet. When he became a Dissenter, he embraced the Arian doctrine, was baptized by Czechovicius, and as he thought it not right for a Christian to take or exact oaths, he resigned his office. He published many books in favour of his sentiments, and one with this singular title. ‘A Demonstration that the Papal Church is neither Apostolical, nor Holy, nor One, nor Catholick.’ The Ministers on the same side were Pauli, Schomann, Lutomirski, and Paclesius. On the Calvinist side the Ministers were Sarnicki, Sylvius, Rokyta, one of the Bohemian Ministers, and Trecius, Rector of a School at Cracow. The Nobility on the same side were Marshal Palatine Firley, a zealous Calvinist, the Castellan Tornicius, and Count Ostrorog, a Nobleman who a few years before, being then Castellan of Posnania, had gone to a meeting of the Bohemian Brethren, intending to drive his lady out with a whip, but happened luckily to be converted on the spot, and joined the Church in the very hour. To these was added Myskowski, Castellan of Sendomir, one of a family who had hoped to ingross the large fortune of a brother’s widow, and had been disappointed by Philipowski, who had married the lady. The Noblemen were Presidents by turns. The Synod sat fourteen days. Firley, being President the first day, opened the session with a short speech, in which he advised the parties to be at peace, and closed by saying, ‘Let us begin the debate in the name of God the Holy Trinity.’ Pauli exclaimed, ‘We are not acquainted with the Trinity, we will not therefore say, Amen.’ ‘Begin then,’ said the President. Pauli made a speech on the

subject: but Sarnicki proposed, before they proceeded any further, to lay down a general rule to be agreed to by both sides, which was, that both should admit the authority of the Councils and primitive Fathers, and by them settle the difference. The Pinckzovians replied, that Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin had rejected traditions in general, and Councils and Fathers, and established Churches in particular; that they had taken Scripture, without any gloss or comment, for the ground of reformation; and that their opponents being Protestants, had in effect renounced all rules of faith and practice except the Scripture, and consequently, unless they abode by that rule in the present case, the Catholics would obtain great advantages over them. The Calvinists could not answer this; and after they had made use of many invectives in the Synod, they caballed out of it, and told the Calvinist Judges that it was a shame such blasphemy should be uttered; that the Bishops would blame them for suffering it; that Hosius and all the Church of Rome had allowed the Trinity and Infant Baptism could not be proved by Scripture; that they could not do impossibilities; and that the Pinckzovians would certainly publish the conference, and give the common people great occasion of triumph. It was necessary therefore to get rid of the affair as well as they could, and it was done artfully enough. They desired a copy of what Pauli had delivered, as it should seem with an intention to answer it on a future day: but, says the impartial Fleury, the Calvinists, who had abundance of proofs taken from Councils and Fathers and Traditions, durst not make use of them; and as they could urge nothing from Scripture, which the opposite party could not answer, they set up chanting in full synod, with all their might, ‘Gloria Patri; Glory be to God the Father, glory be to God the Son, glory be to God the Holy Ghost,’ and so on. This

procedure, adds the same writer, which ought to have been taken for a proof of their ignorance, and the loss of their cause, was considered by the Pinckzovians an insult to the majesty of Almighty God, and they withdrew extremely offended. After their departure, the remainder obtained a promise of the Marshal, who was President that day, that he would make a favourable report to the King; and they agreed to hold no more Conferences with the Pinckzovians, whom they denominated Arians, and to oblige all their own Churches to adhere to the doctrine of one God in three coëqual, coëssential persons. The Arians protested against the injustice of all this; but it did not signify: the die was cast." Firley made his report to the King; and Sienicki, on the part of the Pinckzovians, made his to the chamber of Nuncios. The only practical result of the Conference was, that the two parties, from that time, acted on all occasions independently of each other; and that the Antitrinitarian Church, which had before received a distinct constitution of its own, thenceforward disclaimed all connexion with the orthodox party, having its own Synods, Ministers and Schools, and its own system of Church Government.

Pauli, after his ejection from Trinity Church, remained for some time in Cracow, at the head of a separate congregation, which had embraced his opinions. He then retired to Pinczow, and after that to Racow, where he died, a very old man, in the year 1591, about a month after his friend and contemporary, George Schomann. Faustus Socinus, speaking of him about ten years before this, describes him as a discreet and learned man, who had laboured much and diligently in the Church of God, but was then laid aside by the infirmities of age, and incapacitated for any literary employment, by the weakness of his sight. (F. Socini Opera, Tom. II. p. 1.)

The number of writings, printed or in manuscript, which have been attributed to Gregory Pauli, is twenty-seven, of which little more than the titles, and those imperfectly, can be given in this place. They are as follow.

1. A Picture of the Trinity. This was anonymous, and without date, printer's name, or place of publication; but various circumstances combine to shew, that Gregory Pauli was the author of it. Lauterbach says, that he saw and read this Picture in Poland with horror; and Calvin, in the year 1563, a little before his death, mentions it in his "Brief Admonition to the Polish Brethren," and says that it was not without the bitterest sorrow that he looked upon it.

2. Antihymn: a kind of Appendix to the preceding, in Polish verse, written in reply to a "Hymn" in the same language, in which the Antitrinitarians were compared to Judas Iscariot. Matthias Strikowski is supposed to have been the author of the "Hymn."

3. The Tower of Babel. 8vo. Frankf. on the Oder. Stanislaus Sarnicki, about the year 1563, published a reply to "The Tower of Babel" and "Picture of the Trinity," entitled, "A Comparison, in which the Blasphemy of Gregory of Brzeziny, formerly Minister of Cracow, is openly demonstrated." 4to. pp. 66. The Comparison instituted in this work is that of the ancient and modern Arians.

4. An Antidote to the Articles of a New Faith, exhibited by Sarnicki at Warsaw, in the Character of a New Pope: or, an Antidote to the decretal Canons of Sarnicki. Nieswiez, 8vo. [1563].

5. A monitory Epistle to the Ministers of Zurich. 8vo. [1563]. This refers in part to Calvin's "Brief Admonition to the Polish Brethren," mentioned above.

6. A Poem addressed to John Calvin, and his pious Brethren. 8vo. [1563]. This Poem, consisting of two

hundred and eighteen verses, is given entire in the Appendix to Trechsel's "Die Protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin," iites Buch. Sandius had previously inserted the first four verses in his B. A. (p. 44); and these, excepting a slight error of the press, agree word for word with the manuscript copy still preserved in the Library at Bern, from which Trechsel printed. The poem commences as follows.

"Maximus errorum, quot sunt, quotque ante fuerunt,
Quot vel erunt, Calvine, tuus deprenditur error:
Qui tam præcipiti calamo, describis, in uno
Tres residere Deo[s], Patrem, Verbum et Paracletum." &c.

7. A brief Demonstration concerning the God of Antichrist, &c. 8vo.

8. An Explanation of certain Passages of the Old and New Testament, which Antichrist has obscured, by feigning a Triune God, and a Christ which existed before Jesus, &c. 4to. This work, which is in the Polish language, is without either date, or author's name: but it was printed at Pinczow in the reign of Sigismund Augustus, who died A. D. 1572.

9. A Letter to Bullinger. *MS.* 1562. In this Letter the author sets forth his own opinion respecting the Supremacy of the Father, in opposition to Stancarus.

10. A Polish Version of Faustus Socinus's Explanation of the Proëm of John's Gospel. 4to. This is without translator's and author's name; or time and place of publication.

11. A Speech on the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity, delivered at the Conference of Petricow, A. D. 1565. This Speech is given by Lubieniecius in his "Hist. Ref. Pol." L. iii. C. v. pp. 202—205.

12. The first Racovian Catechism. On this subject more will be said in the account of George Schomann. (Vide *Art.* 49.)

13. A Letter to Stanislaus Budzinius on the Question of Magistracy, and the Use of Arms. 1574. *MS.*

14. A Reply to those who defend the Preëxistence of the Son of God. [1578.]

15. On the Invocation of Christ; written about the year 1579.

16. A Reply, in the name of the Racovian Church, to a Treatise of James Palæologus, in which he teaches, that Christ did not abolish the political Magistracy. 1573, 1581.

17. A Treatise on the Millennium. [1590.]

18. An Interpretation of the Words of Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 6. This was written in the Polish language, and is alluded to by Modrevius in his first "Sylva," C. i. Tract. i.

19. Twenty Theses (concerning the Trinity, &c.) proposed at Racow, A.D. 1598, though not by the author himself, he having been dead seven years before that time.

20. Equivalent and synonymous Scriptural Expressions concerning Jesus the Messiah, or concerning the Son of God born of Mary, &c. This is a Polish translation of Blandrata's little work on the same subject. Bock conjectures that it was printed at Pinezow.

21. The Difference between the Old and New Testament, or Judaism and Christianity, from which may be seen nearly the whole Difference in Matters of Faith. 1568. This seems to have been borrowed from the "Christianismi Restitutio" of Servetus, and is in the Polish language.

22. A Description of Antichrist and his Kingdom, from his own Characters, as set forth in the Word of God, of which sixty are found in this Work. 4to. This also is a Polish translation from the "Christianismi Restitutio" of Servetus.

23. Some Brief Arguments against Pædobaptism: in the Polish Language.

24. On the true Death, Resurrection and eternal Life of Jesus Christ our Lord, and by consequence of all the Faithful, &c.: in the same language.

25. Theses mentioned by John Meisner. Cracow, 1568. Bock thinks that this may be the same as No. 19.

26. Some writers have said, that Gregory Pauli published pictorial representations of a temple, of which Luther stripped off the roof, Calvin threw down the walls, and he himself dug up the foundations.

27. Stanislaus Sarnieki attributes to G. P. a work, entitled, "Revelationes Nieswiezenses," and another which he calls "Propositiones ob Spem Concordiæ exhibitæ," from both of which he quotes. These must have been in Polish, because the quotations are in that language.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 31. 43—45. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 597—628. *Lubienicci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. vii. viii.; L. iii. C. i. v. *Stoinii* Epitome, *passim*. *And. Wissoicatii* Narratio Compend. pp. 211, 212. *Ruari* Epist. N. 46. *Robinson's* Ecclesiastical Researches, Chap. xv. pp. 569, 586, 587. *Fausti Socini* Opera, l. c. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. vii. p. 335; Chap. viii. pp. 357—365. *Trechsel*, *Lel. Sozini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit*. Beilage xx. S. 492—494. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. (Gregoire) PAULI.

47.

MARTIN CROVICIUS, (*Polon.* KROWICKI,) was a Polish Knight, who presided successively as Pastor over the Churches of Pinczow and Piaski, near Lublin, in the last of which situations he died, in the month of December, 1573. He was originally a Catholic Priest; but after the Reformation had extended itself to Poland, he officiated as a Minister of the Evangelical Church at Pinczow, and not only joined the Reformed party, but became himself an active and zealous reformer. Even while he remained in communion with the Catholic Church, he preached against the worship of saints and images; and denounced it as

an innovation, and a practice unknown to the primitive Church. He also discontinued the use of the Latin language in the public services of religion, and began to say mass in the vernacular tongue, before he passed over to the ranks of the reformers.

In 1555, when an attempt was made to visit him with the severest penalties which it was in the power of the Church to inflict, for having married, he was patronized, and protected from the insidious attacks of Andrew Zebrowski, Bishop of Cracow, by Nicholas Olesnicki, governor of Pinczow. The wily Prelate, when he found his schemes frustrated, and was unable to retain possession of the person of his intended victim, attacked him with his pen; and in reply, Crovicius published a vindication of his opinions in the Polish language, entitled, "A Defence of the true and ancient Christian Doctrine, against the false modern Roman Discipline, which Andrew, Bishop of Cracow, defends by Force instead of Scripture." Pinczow, 4to.

In a letter, addressed to John a Lasco, from Petricow, and dated January 26th, 1559, Crovicius, after alluding to the political events of the day, says, "We preach, and collect Christian audiences, but are forbidden by Trzebowski, in the King's name, to assemble any longer for public prayer and preaching. This has been done to please the Bishops, who, however, have not been able to accomplish their object: for we preach even to this very day freely and publicly." He adds, "We have not yet resisted unto blood: what will be the issue, Your Excellency shall shortly know."

Crovicius composed some lines in the Polish language, which were replete with the most terrible accusations against the bloody persecutions, carried on against the Protestants in Poland. Count Valerian Krasinski gives a

copy of these lines, in his "Sketch of the Reformation in Poland," (Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. iii. p. 177,) and subjoins the following literal translation of them. "If the dungeons of Cracow could speak, if the tortures of Lipowiec dared to talk, every body would know how people were starved, beaten, and tormented in a pagan manner. Ye shall have to answer before God for the death of the Priest Michel; but, although you will burn all his books, you shall never destroy the divine truth, which proves that ye are scribes, pharisees, and condemned people!" Who the Priest Michel was, or what kind of death he suffered, the author of these lines does not inform us, and his translator professes his inability to discover.

The Apology above mentioned was written about the year 1557, but not published till 1560. Soon after its publication, Crovicius composed "A larger Apology, or Defence of the true Doctrine concerning the most ancient Christian Faith, which the holy Prophets, Christ the Son of God, and his Apostles taught, in Opposition to the false Doctrine and new Faith, which the Roman Pontiff teaches in his Churches." This was written in the Polish language, and appears to have been printed in 1584. A German translation of it, by James Markovitz, appeared in 1602; and the original was reprinted at Wilna, in 1604, in 4to. Bock supposes it to have been written in the year 1562, before the author had renounced the Trinity; because Crovicius professes his belief in the doctrine of the two natures in the person of Christ, and contends that he is of the same essence with the Father, according to his divine nature. At what precise time he joined the Antitrinitarian party is not known.

He is mentioned, along with Alciati, George Schomann, and Socinus, by Andrew Dudithius, as one who, both by his writings and teachings against the commonly received

doctrines of the Trinity, and the twofold nature of Christ, had contributed to throw great light upon those subjects.

In addition to the works already mentioned, he addressed a letter to Stanislaus Budzinius, from Piaski, in 1573, (the year of his own death,) in which he blamed the Racovians for excluding the Magistrate from the communion of the Church. In this letter, which Budzinius inserted in his manuscript "Commentaries," so often alluded to in this work, Crovicius not only contended that the Magistrate was necessary for the public safety, but allowed the use of arms.

In his last Will, he recorded the transactions in which he had been engaged, and the persecutions which he had undergone. Sandius tells us, (B. A. p. 46,) that the autograph of this curious document was once in the possession of James Milius, Pastor of the Reformed Church at Belzyce, in Poland, by whom Andrew Wissowatius was favoured with the sight and perusal of it.

In the Synodical Acts of the Unitarian Church in Poland, mention is sometimes made of a MARTIN POLONUS. (Bock, Hist. Ant. T. I. P. ii. p. 646.) Might not this have been Martin Crovicius, who was probably a Pole by birth; and might he not sometimes have been called *Martin Polonus*, or *Martin the Pole*, to distinguish him from *Martin Cellarius*, who was a German, and *Rudolph Martin*, or Adam Pastoris, who was either a Dutchman, or a Westphalian? There was a Martin Polonus, an author of the thirteenth century; and another, who became a student in the university of Königsberg, at its first establishment, in 1544, during the Rectorship of Sarinus, and whose name is inserted in the academical roll for that year. But whether it was the latter of these, who afterwards joined the Antitrinitarians, cannot with certainty be determined. There is no chronological improbability in the supposition, that

Martin Crovicius and Martin Polonus were the same person.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 45, 46. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 205—209. 646. *Gabbema*, Epistolar. ab Illustr. et Clar. Viris Scriptar. Cent. Tres. Harling. Fris. 1663, Cent. i. N. 59. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. i. p. 142; Chap. ii. pp. 176, 177. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. POLOXUS.

48.

ALEXANDER VITRELINUS was Pastor of Pinczow in the year 1555. He is often mentioned in the Synodical Acts; but little is known of his personal history, beyond the meagre account, which Sandius has furnished of him. (B. A. p. 46.) While he was at Pinczow, Nicholas Olesnicki was his patron. He afterwards became Pastor of the Church at Wengrow, in Podlachia, which was under the patronage of John Kiszka, President General of Samogitia.

The following is a list of the writings of Vitrelinus.

1. The Judgment of the Polish Churches in the Cause of Francis Davidis, concerning the Invocation of the Man Christ Jesus, Son of the living God; transmitted to George Blandrata and the other Brethren in Transylvania. Written at the Synod held at Belzyce, Aug. 24th, 1579, and signed by Alex. Vitrelinus, in the Name of all the Ministers. Clausenburg, 1579.

2. On Baptism, against Faustus Socinus. *MS.*

3. A Letter to Christian Francken against his Opinion concerning the Non-invocation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; written in the Name of the Synod of Wengrow, May, 1584. *MS.*

4. An Explanation of the first Chapter of John's Gospel. A.D. 1584. This work, if first written in Polish, as Sandius supposes, was translated into Latin, and published in 4to. at Losk, in Lithuania, A.D. 1586. But Bock thinks

that it was written originally in Latin. Daniel Clemen-
tinus, who quotes from it, says, that by "the beginning"
Vitrelinus understood, the commencement of the human
nature of Jesus Christ in the womb of Mary.

5. On the Sin against the Holy Ghost. This work,
which is extremely rare, was unknown to Sandius; but is
mentioned by Dan. Salthenius, in his "*Bibl. Librorum*
Rarior."

6. Possibly, too, Vitrelinus was the author of another
work, of which no copy is now known to exist, but of
which Salthenius gives the title, in the following words.
"Veritas, non Persona: seu Consensus Evangelicus et
Apostolicus in his, quæ sunt Cœna Domini."

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 46, 47. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 983
—986.

49.

GEORGE SCHOMANN was born at Ratibor, in Silesia, in
the year 1530. The names of his parents were John Sta-
nislaus Lossel, commonly called Schomann, and Ursula,
daughter of Christopher Tiachowski, Chancellor of the
Duke of Ratibor. Though of good family, his mother
had no fortune; for she was robbed of that by her brother
Christopher, who seized upon the property of the whole
family.

In his boyhood, Schomann was taught Grammar and
Music, and educated in the Romish faith. In 1546, he
went to Breslau, where he made some progress in the Arts;
and from an obstinate Papist, was converted to a kind of
Lutheranism by his master, John Cyrus, who, after going
into Italy, relapsed into Popery, and endeavoured to re-con-
vert his pupil, by forcing upon him a canonry of Breslau.
But the attempt was unsuccessful, for Schomann was so
far from yielding to his entreaties, that he resigned a

canonry, which he already possessed at Ratibor. His master having been foiled in his attempts to procure the bishopric of Breslau, turned Monk, and became Abbot of the Monastery of St. Vincent, at Breslau; while he himself took charge of the education of Joachim and Frederick Malitzani, in the hope of accompanying them into France. But this hope was frustrated.

In 1552, he went to Cracow, where he made some progress in the study of Polite Literature and Philosophy. In 1554, he became an inmate in the house of Jerome Buzenski, manager of the salt-mines at Wielitska, who appointed him tutor to his nephews, and some other noble youths; and he continued to act in that capacity for a period of six years, during which he discharged his duties faithfully and assiduously to his pupils, as well as satisfactorily to their friends. This was a situation, in which he saw much of the world, and was exposed to temptations, from which he escaped, only, as he says, by the special providence of God. In 1558, he accompanied some of his pupils to Pinczow, and others to Wittenberg, where he derived great benefit from his intercourse with Peter Statorius and Philip Melanchthon. On his return from Wittenberg, he put himself under the care of John a Lasco, from whose judicious instruction he expected to receive much advantage; but the death of that excellent man deprived him, as well as many others, of a faithful guide, and true friend. At this time he was at Pinczow, where he lived upon terms of familiar intercourse with Peter Statorius, John Thenaud, Francis Lismaninus, George Blandrata, and Bernardine Ochinus; and became convinced that the doctrine of a perfect coëquality in the three persons of the Godhead is an error, and forms no part of the religion of the New Testament, which teaches that there is One God the Father, One Son of God, and One Holy

Spirit. He confesses, however, that he stood in need of further information on many points pertaining to this subject.

In 1560, he was nominated Minister of the Church at Pinczow, which was under the patronage of Nicholas Olesnicki; and on the 18th of February, in that year, he married. About this time, Blandrata pointed out to him, and his friends, some objections, to which the doctrine of the Trinity was liable. These objections they submitted to the judgment of Gilowski, who confessed his inability to furnish a satisfactory reply to them.

In the autumn of 1561, Schomann was sent, by the Church and Synod, to exercise the office of the ministry at Xionx, which was within the jurisdiction of John Bonar, Castellan of Biecz, and Grand Procurator of Cracow, who ordered him to be expelled, and spoiled of all his goods, on account of his heterodoxy on the subject of the Trinity.

His first child, Paul, was born January 15th, 1562, and was baptized while an infant, no question having then been raised as to the validity of Infant Baptism.

In 1563, he was sent, by the Church, with Jerome Philipovius, and Stanislaus Lasocki, to the Diet at Petricow; and while there, was charged with Arianism by Sarnicki and his party, who formally withdrew from the Conference.

On the 22nd of January, 1564, his eldest daughter was born: but her father being now convinced, that Pædobaptism is destitute of scriptural authority, resolved to defer her baptism, till she should have attained to years of maturity. In this same year, he received instructions to accompany Jerome Philipovius to the Diet at Warsaw, to answer a charge of heresy brought against them by Sarnicki, as blasphemers of the Trinity: but through the instrumentality of Prince Nicholas Radzivil, Palatine of Wilna, the machinations of Sarnicki were frustrated, and

each party was allowed to profess its own opinions without further molestation. In the year following, Schomann again accompanied Philipovius to the Diet at Petricow, and engaged in a dispute with the Trinitarian party, which lasted a fortnight. But the assembly, as we have already seen in the account of Gregory Pauli, broke up, after a stormy debate, without coming to any decision. In 1566, however, when Schomann was deputed to attend the Diet with Philipovius and Stanislaüs Cicovius, the adverse party so prevailed, that the Unitarians were obliged to make a precipitate retreat from the city; yet they obtained from the King, through Nicholas Sienicki, the interlocutor of their party, a promise, that they should not be molested on account of their religious opinions while he lived. From that time they absented themselves from the Diets; and the orthodox obtained so much influence with the patrons of the Churches, as to induce them to eject those Ministers, who impugned the doctrine of the Trinity.

About this time, some of the brethren learned, from Lælius Socinus's "*Rhapsodies on the Prophet Isaiah*," that the Son of God is not the second person of the Trinity, coëssential and coëqual with the Father, but the man Christ Jesus, conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified, and raised from the dead. Schomann and his friends were now induced to search the Scriptures with redoubled diligence. Before this time, indeed, his views had ceased to be Trinitarian: but he had not seen his way so clearly as he now did, through the intricacies, by which the orthodox creed is surrounded. Mosheim says, that Schomann and his Pinczovian flock were not Socinians before the year 1566, which is perfectly true; because the Socinian doctrine, as taught in the "*Rhapsodies*" of Lælius, was unknown to them till that time, and was not fully developed, till his nephew Faus-

tus came to reside among them some ten or twelve years later.

Schomann left Pinczow in 1567, and went to Chmielnik, where he took up his abode with John Olesnicki. On the 20th of August, 1569, while he was still at Chmielnik, his daughter Martha was born. About this time, he went with Philipovius, Simon Ronenberg, and some others, into Moravia, to hold a consultation on the practicability of forming a union with the Anabaptists of that country. But the mission proved unsuccessful; for their difference on doctrinal points was found to be so great, as to present an insuperable barrier to the union which was sought. "When they arrived," says Robinson, "they conversed with these brethren, and were extremely pleased with the regularity of their lives, and the simple discipline of their Churches: but when they came to speak of the doctrine of the nature of God, and affirm that they did not believe the Supreme Being existed in three persons, the Moravians considered them as little better than Atheists, and contended so sharply for a triune God, as to convince the Poles, that they could not admit Arians into their communion. Back they went solitary and sad, and their report was so affecting to the rest, that, adding to it the dismal state of affairs at home, they thought of throwing all up, and resigning themselves to a fate which seemed to forbid them to strive any longer for peace, against a world gone mad with error, and vice, and intolerance. For a few weeks most of them left off preaching: only Czechovicus and Schomann persevered."

About three years after this unsuccessful attempt to form a union with the Anabaptists of Moravia, Schomann was baptized by immersion at Chmielnik; and in 1573, he was sent to the ministry of the Minor Church at Cracow, as the assistant of Gregory Pauli. Here his wife also was

baptized, in the garden of Konarski, Castellan of Cracow. On the 1st of August, 1574, his wife's mother followed her daughter's example, and was baptized at Chmielnik; and on the last day of the same month his younger son, Peter, was born. But the baptism of this second son, like that of the daughters, was deferred till he had arrived at years of responsibility.

Some of the Anabaptist party, among whom was George Schomann, held a Conference with Faustus Socinus, on the subject of Baptism, in the year 1577. Socinus approved of Baptism by immersion, but said that it was not necessary in his own case, as he had not learnt his religion from them.

At the beginning of the year 1586, Schomann was sent from Cracow to the ministry of the Church at Luclavice; and in the year following he returned to Chmielnik, where he died in 1591, about a year before Gregory Pauli, his friend and former colleague.

It is asserted by Mosheim, (vide *Art. 52*,) that Schomann was the original author of the celebrated Racovian Catechism; and John Adam Müller has also ascribed it to him, in his Dissertation, "*De Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione Fidei omnium prima*," inserted in a collection of writings, published by Bartholomæus, under the title, "*Fortgesetzten nützlichen Ammerkungen von allerhand Materien*." (P. xxi. p. 758; apud Mosheimii Institut. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. Pars. ii. C. iv. § x. p. 715, Not. p.) Towards the conclusion of Schomann's Will, there is an address to his children and grandchildren, which seems to confirm this opinion of Mosheim and Müller. In this address he says, "If I could have seen a purer Church in my age, or heard of one, I should certainly have joined its communion: but here, as you know, I have worshiped God the Father Most High, and the man Christ

Jesus, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, in spirit and in truth, according to our Catechism, which I had specially collected for you out of the sacred writings." (*Test.* p. 196.) Sandius, therefore, appears to be mistaken in supposing, that Gregory Pauli was the original compiler of this work. Nor is there more probability in the opinion of those, who have attributed it to Faustus Socinus; for he, in writing to Smalcus, Feb. 14th, 1595, speaks of his "Catechism begun scarcely three years ago," from which it manifestly appears, that it must have been undertaken after the death of Schomann. In a subsequent letter to Valentine Radecius, Nov. 23rd, 1603, Socinus says, "Statorius, after much reflection, and consultation on the subject with other brethren, has at length determined, as regards my labours, that, except the remodelling of the Catechism which is to be published, and to which I ought to apply along with him, I shall do nothing else than finish my reply to the Posnansians." The reason of this caution appears to have been the growing infirmity of Socinus. We shall hereafter find Statorius associated with Smalcus and others, in the preparation of a Catechism for the press, which was probably no other than that of George Schomann, enlarged and revised, from time to time, after the period of the author's death.

Schomann was not a voluminous writer. In addition to the Scriptural Catechism, which he compiled, and which was printed, in 12mo., at Cracow, in 1574, by Alexander Turobinus, or Turobinezyek, (*vide Art.* 52,) Sandius and Bock mention nothing as having been written by him, but his "Testamentum," or Last Will; which the former has printed, with some other valuable pieces, by way of Appendix to his "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*" (pp. 191—198); and which throws considerable light upon the history of Unitarianism in Poland, during the writer's own time.

But he translated from Polish into Latin a small piece of John Niemojevius's against a part of Faustus Socinus's treatise, "De J. C. Servatore."

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 47. *Schomanni* Testamentum, *passim*. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 825—827. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Chap. xv. p. 594. *Mosh.* Inst. H. E. l. c. *F. Socini* Opera, T. I. pp. 459. 492. *Zeltneri* Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. Lips. 1729, 4to. p. 48, Not. b. *Rees's* Hist. Introd. to Racov. Catechism, pp. lxxi—lxxvii.

50.

PETER STATORIUS, of Thionville, in Lorraine, was the head of a family, of whom several obtained considerable distinction among the Socinians. Three were particularly celebrated, namely, Peter the father, Peter the son, and John the grandson. In Poland, where Peter Statorius the elder was naturalized by the Diet as a Noble, he took the name of STOIENSKI, or STOINSKI, which, in its Latinized form, is written STOINIUS.

Peter Statorius, Senior, in his youth, was a disciple of Beza, who says that he was corrupted by Blandrata, while a student at Geneva. In the Preface to his account of Valentine Gentilis, Beza calls Statorius a young man of good disposition, and no despicable attainments, but one who devoted himself wholly to the specious fictions of Blandrata. Subjoined to Caspar Heltus's "Confession respecting the Mediator," &c., which was printed at Wittenberg, in 1555, 8vo., is An Ode on Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God the Father and Men, by Peter Statorius. The verse is of the mixed kind, known by the name of *dicolos tetrastrophos*; and the doctrine, as far as can be collected from the specimens given by Bock, (Hist. Ant. T. I. P. ii. pp. 912, 913,) perfectly orthodox.

In the year 1559, Statorius went into Poland; and in the course of that year, the above mentioned "Confession," with his Ode, was reprinted at Pinczow. He succeeded

Orsacius in the Rectorship of the School of Pinczow, where, in the month of January, 1560, he delivered a funeral oration on John a Lasco, who was interred with great pomp in the Church of that place. This oration was published during the same year at Pinczow, and dedicated to Francis Lismaninus.

At this time, Statorius had already begun to shew signs of the heterodox tendency of his opinions. Wengerscius speaks of a feigned Confession, which he exhibited at the Synod of Pinczow, in 1559; and Paul Gilowski said of him, at the Synod of Sandomir, "whatever evil is now silently working its way in Poland, Statorius is the prime mover of it." His opinions on the subject of the Trinity were probably not sound, or in other words, they did not come up to the true Athanasian standard, when he attended the Synod at Pinczow, in 1559. In the Confession above alluded to, he says, "*Prophetica et Apostolica doctrina, quæ veram Dei Patris, Filii et Spiritus Sancti cognitionem continet, amplector et veneror, parique religione, Deum Patrem, Filium, ac S. Spiritum, distincte secundum sacrarum literarum veritatem colendum, implorandumque precibus, libere profiteor: denique omnem hæreticam de Deo Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto blasphemiam, plane detestor, sive Ariana illa, sive Servetiana, Eunomiana, Stancariana fuerit.*" Here he professes to embrace and venerate the prophetic and apostolic doctrine, which, as he says, contains the true knowledge of God the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and in the same religious manner, he freely professes, that God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are to be separately worshiped, according to the truth of the sacred Scriptures; and finally, that he openly detests all heretical blasphemy concerning God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, whether it be Arian, or Servetian, or Eunomian, or Stancarian. That this Confession is

drawn up with remarkable caution is evident; but that any well-informed Trinitarian could be misled by it, so as to regard it as thoroughly sound and orthodox in its sentiments, is scarcely credible. Still it would be unfair to say, that it was made in bad faith, and did not at the time contain a correct expression of the writer's views. In the year 1560, Statorius published, *Very brief Animadversions on two Dialogues of Martin Cromer, "On the true and false Religion of our Time."* Pinczow, 8vo. These Animadversions were anonymous, and contained no internal evidence of having proceeded from the pen of Peter Statorius; but that he was the author of them we learn from John Lætus, who ascribes them to him, in his "*Compend. Hist. Univ.* p. 541, Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1643," 8vo. The work of Martin Cromer, which called them forth, was written in the Polish language; but a Latin translation of it was published at Paris in 1568, and at Cologne in the same year. Statorius appears, in his "*Animadversions*" upon Cromer's Dialogues, as an advocate for the Invocation of Christ: but he asks, whether the Apostles have anywhere said, that the Holy Ghost is God? and his reply to this question is, that, if the Holy Ghost be God, there can be no doubt, that he is an object of adoration. He contends, however, that the doctrine of one divine essence in three persons may be proved by the testimony of Scripture.

The next work of Statorius was, *A brief Apology for himself and the universal Church of Christ, in reply to the Calumnies of Stancarus*, 8vo. This appears, from the character of the types, to have been printed at Pinczow; and, as Bock supposes, issued from the press of Daniel Luncicius, in 1560. It was directed mainly to the refutation of Stancarus's hypothesis, that before the incarnation of Christ there was no Mediator.

When Remigius Chelmius presented to the Synod at

Pieczow, January 25th, 1561, a document, in which he recommended, that the Holy Spirit should not be invoked, as a separate object of worship, Statorius expressed himself favourable to that opinion; but did so with great caution and moderation. A Conference was afterwards appointed on this subject, between Statorius and certain Ministers, in which he shewed, with great learning and eloquence, that the Holy Spirit is not a third person in the Godhead, but the power and gift of God, which God excites in the hearts of the faithful, and of which he gives a portion to every one, according to his will; but that he has given it to his Son without measure, and that, from this fulness of the Son, every one of the faithful has received some portion. Hence he inferred, that the Holy Spirit is not the God of heaven, and the Creator of the earth, because HE cannot be measured, given, or divided into parts. These opinions were embodied, by Statorius, in A Letter to Remigius Chelmius, written by order of the Synod of Pieczow, and dated January 30th, 1561.

Statorius was a strenuous adversary of Pædobaptism, and took an active part in the controversy on that subject in Poland. He also did much towards the advancement of Polish literature; for he was the author of the first Polish Grammar, published at Cracow, A.D. 1568, 8vo., and one of the authors of the first version of the Bible into the Polish language.

Sandius mentions, in a list of "Anonymous Authors," at the end of his "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*," (p. 172,) a Letter on the commonly received doctrine of the Trinity, which Francis Junius has inserted in his "*Defence of the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity*," and which bears the following title. "*Epistola quam Præceptorî orthodoxo scripsit Discipulus Arianus.*" This letter, which purports to have been addressed by an Arian scholar to an orthodox

master, has been attributed by some to Faustus Socinus; but Sandius says, "I know not who could be the orthodox master of Faustus Socinus, who was self-taught, and had no master, but his uncle Lælius." He conjectures, therefore, that the Arian disciple was Peter Statorius, of Thionville, who had Theodore Beza for his Preceptor. Bock regards it as beyond all doubt, that the author of the Letter in question was Peter Statorius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 47, 48. 172. *Stoinii* Epitome, p. 185. *Schomanni* Test. p. 193. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 911—922. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. i. C. v. p. 33; L. ii. C. viii. p. 148. *Hoornbeek*, Summa Controv. L. vii. p. 565, etc.

51.

REMIGIUS or REMIANUS CHELMIUS, (*Polon.* CHELMSKI,) was a Polish Knight, and Standard-bearer of the Palatinate of Cracow. Count Krasinski mentions him under the name of *Remigius Chelmicki*; and says, that he was one of a number of distinguished individuals, who accompanied Valenty, Rector of Krzczonow, a parish in the diocese of Cracow, when that Clergyman appeared before the Ecclesiastical Court of his Bishop, Maciejowski, in the year 1549, to answer to the charge of having publicly married a wife, contrary to the laws of the Church.

He was the author of an anonymous letter on the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, dated Nov. 19th, 1559, and addressed to the Synod held at Pinczow, on the 22nd of the same month. In this letter, he contended that prayer ought to be addressed to the Father only, through the Son and the Holy Spirit. This opinion is said to have been instilled into him by Peter Statorius, to whom he addressed another unpublished letter on the same subject, January 25th, 1561.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 48. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 97, 98. *Stoinii* Epitome, p. 185. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. ii. p. 161.

52.

MARTIN CHELMIUS, or CHELSKI, is described by Mosheim as “one of the most eminent and zealous of the Socinian teachers;” and is mentioned by him, in connexion with a summary of religious doctrine, which was printed at Cracow by Alex. Turobinczyk, in 12mo., A.D. 1574. “From this little performance,” says the historian, “and from this alone, we may learn with certainty the true state of the Unitarian religion before Faustus Socinus; and nevertheless, I do not find that it has been so much as once quoted, or even mentioned by any of the Socinian writers, by any historians who have given an account of their sect, nor yet by any of the Divines that have drawn the pen of religious controversy against their religious system.” (*Inst. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § x. p. 715, Not. p.*)

This Catechism, which is extremely rare, is ascribed to George Schomann by John Adam Müller, in his Dissertation, “*De Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione Fidei omnium prima;*” and is supposed to be the identical Catechism, mentioned in his Will. It bears the following title. “*Catechesis et Confessio Fidei Cœtus per Poloniam congregati in Nomine Jesu Christi Domini nostri crucifixi et resuscitati. Deuterono. 6. Audi Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est. Johannis 8. dicit Jesus: Quem vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est Pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini Anno nati Jesu Christi, Filii Dei 1574,*” 12mo. pp. 160. In the beginning of the Catechism, the whole of Christianity is reduced to six points. 1. The Nature of God, and his Son Jesus Christ. 2. Justification. 3. Discipline. 4. Prayer. 5. Baptism. 6. The Lord’s Supper. Each of these is defined, and unfolded in general terms, in a single question and answer, and is afterwards subdivided into several branches, in various questions and

answers, in which its different parts are illustrated and confirmed by texts of Scripture. At the end is a piece entitled “*Œconomia Christiana, seu Pastoratus Domesticus*,” which contains short instructions to heads of families; and forms of prayer for morning, evening, and other occasions.

A copy of this Catechism, which fell into the hands of Mosheim, was given by Martin Chemius to Christopher Heiligmeier, in the year 1580, as appears by a long inscription, written by the donor, at the end of Mosheim’s copy. In this inscription Chemius promises his friend other productions of the same kind, provided he receives that one favourably; and concludes with these words of St. Paul. “God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.”

VIDEND. *Mosheim*. Inst. H. E. l. c. *Rees’s Hist.* Introd. to Rac. Cat. pp. lxxii—lxxvii.

53.

JOHN SECURINUS is mentioned by Przypcovius, in his Life of Faustus Socinus, as the first, who ventured publicly to defend the opinions which Lælius Socinus held. In the Synod of Lancut, A.D. 1567, he boldly advocated these opinions against the Arian party, maintaining that Christ had no existence, prior to his birth into this world. He did the same thing at the Conference, which was held at Skrzynna, during the same year. Lubieniecus, in his “History of the Polish Reformation,” describes him as a man of extraordinary simplicity of character, but particularly well acquainted with the sacred writings, an eloquent speaker, and a person of the strictest veracity; and says, that he was the first among the Polish Unitarians, who was baptized by immersion. It was chiefly owing to his persuasive eloquence, that James Sieninius, Palatine of

Podolia, was induced to leave the Calvinistic, and join the Antitrinitarian party.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 828. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. iii. pp. 190, 191.

54.

LUKE STERNBERGER, (or, as some write the name, STERNBERG,) is properly ranked by Bock among modern Antitrinitarians, although he differed from the generality of them on many points. He is not honoured with a place in Sandius's "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*;" but this may have been, because he is not known to have left any writings behind him. Trinitarians, and Roman Catholics in particular, have not been sparing in their abuse of him; and if all that is said of him be true, his name would be no great honour to any cause. Laurence Surius, the Carthusian, describes him as "an impious, blasphemous, and thrice-execrable villain."

Being educated a Catholic, he embraced the monastic life; but growing weary of that, and of his vow of celibacy, he became a Lutheran, and studied under Melancthon, in whose school he made such proficiency, that, in the year 1561, he was deemed worthy to undertake the pastoral charge of a Church at Ohnutz. From reading the works of Servetus, however, and other Antitrinitarians, he was led to renounce the doctrine of the Trinity; and after publicly teaching his new opinions in Moravia, he went into Poland. Lamy says this, and much more of him; but as Lamy is an author worthy of little credit, we may pass over the rest of his account, and proceed to avail ourselves of those of more trustworthy writers.

According to Sandius, in his Hist. Eccles. Enucl., Sternberger taught, that all, who believe and worship the Trinity, are Tritheists; that the word *Trinity* is superfluous and

absurd, and is nowhere found in Scripture ; and that there is but one God in heaven. He therefore, continues Sandius, forbade the singing of the beautiful hymn, "O veneranda Trinitas," and insisted upon the words "O veneranda Dei Bonitas" being sung instead. He further taught, that Christ is not the Supreme God, and that he rose from the dead, not by any divine power of his own, but by the power of the Almighty ; and wrought no miracle, but by the same power, the Almighty having endowed him with gifts superior to those of all other Prophets. He admitted, indeed, that Christ was the Son of God ; but only as regarded his soul.

From this account of Sandius, it would appear, that Sternberger's opinion bore some resemblance to that of Apollinarius, who taught, that Christ had the body and flesh of a man, but not a human soul, the place of which was supplied by the Logos.

Spondanus says, that he vomited forth his blasphemies in the city of Olmutz ; denying the Trinity, * * * and asserting that Christ was a man, like other mortals, the son of Joseph and Mary, and was adopted as the Son of God, when the voice was heard from heaven at John's baptism ; that the Holy Spirit was nothing but a dove ; that the sabbath ought to be observed in preference to the Lord's day ; and that Baptism was an institution of Satan.

This description of Spondanus would lead one to suppose, that Sternberger's notion respecting Jesus Christ approached more nearly to that of Cerinthus, than to that of Apollinarius. But the truth is, that all accounts of the opinions of such men are to be received with some degree of allowance, whether they proceed from the pens of Catholics, or orthodox Protestants ; for it not unfrequently happens, (*vide Art. 182,*) that a reputed heretic is charged with ten or a dozen different heresies, of which the larger

proportion are incompatible with each other, and could not possibly have been held by the same person.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 966—969. *Sandii Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, Colon. 1676, 4to. L. iii. A. 1561, p. 429. [*Lamy*] *Histoire du Socinianisme*, &c. Paris, 1723, 4to. P. ii. Chap. x. pp. 276—278, etc.

55.

STANISLAÛS CICOVIUS, (*Polon.* CIKOWSKI,) of Woyslavice, held the office of Arch-chamberlain of Cracow; and afterwards those of Castellan of Biecz, and General of the army. He was the first patron of the Church at Cracow, of which Gregory Pauli was appointed Pastor in 1562.

He superintended the printing of the Acts of the Synod and Conference, held at Skrzynna in the year 1567, with all the answers of those, who denied that the Word, or Son of God, assisted in the creation of the visible world; and maintained, in reply to the objections of the adverse party, that he had his beginning in the time of John the Baptist, and John the Evangelist. Sandius mentions the names of those, who acted as Collocutors and Scribes in this Conference. On the part of those, who denied the preëxistence of Christ, the Collocutors were George Schomann, Gregory Pauli, John Securinus, Matthias Albinus, John Baptist of Lithuania, Martin Crovicius, Simon Budnæus, and James Calinovius; and the Scribes, Laurence Koscienski and Stanislaïus Budzinski. On the part of those, who asserted that Jesus Christ existed before his mother, the Collocutors were John Cazanovius, Stanislaïus Farnovius, John Niemojevius, Judge of Inovladislavia, Nicholas Zytno, John Falconius, Martin Czechovicius, Daniel Bilinius; and the Scribes, Laurence Criscovius and Thomas Swiechovius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 48, 49. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 101, 102.

56.

JOHN CAZANOVIVS, (*Polon.* CASZANOWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, who, at the memorable Conference held at Petricow, A.D. 1562, went over to the Antitrinitarian party. Sandius says, that his opinions were almost identical with those of Peter Gonesius, and that he was a Preacher of those opinions; but that he afterwards became Sub-judge of Lucow. His works were as follow.

1. A Reply to Calvin's Letters to the Polish Brethren. Written about the year 1563.

2. A Book against the Trinitarians. In reference to this, Andrew Fricius Modrevius says, "these and many other testimonies, the advocates of a unity of essence in the Father and the Son, collect from the Scriptures: but Bernardine Ochinus the Italian, and our countryman John Cazanovius, have separately, and, in my opinion, accurately confuted these testimonies in their books."

3. Remarks in Elucidation of the Conference held at Petricow in 1565. At this Conference there were present, on the part of the Unitarians, Gregory Pauli of Brzeziny, Minister of Cracow; George Schomann, Minister of Xionx; Stanislaüs Paclesius, Minister of Lublin; John Niemojevius, Judge of Inovladislavia; John Lutomirscius, Castellan of Sieradz; Stanislaüs Lutomirscius, Superintendent of Little Poland; Nicholas Sienicus, Marshal of the Equestrian Order; and Jerome Philipovius, Receiver-general of the district of Cracow. The Scribes, or Secretaries, were Albert Romæus, and John Cazanovius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 49. 172, 173. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 96.

57.

STEPHEN BASILU, Minister of the Saxon Church in Clausenburg, was converted to the Unitarian opinions in the time of John II., Prince of Transylvania; and employed

his talents as a Preacher in their diffusion. He was the author of an unpublished treatise, entitled, “*Responsiones in Loca V. et N. Testt. quibus Fides de SS. Triade adstruitur;*” which served as the foundation of George Enyedi’s celebrated treatise on the same subject.

VIDEND. Mon. Rep. Vol. XV. (1820) pp. 193, 194.

58.

JOHN SIGISMUND, Prince of Transylvania, invited George Blandrata to his Court in 1563, and appointed him his Physician. He was the first of the Transylvanian Princes, who granted to the impugnors of the doctrine of the Trinity the free exercise of their religion. He became a proselyte to the opinions of Blandrata; and it was in his time, that those, who asserted the Supremacy of the Father, were first called UNITARIANS. At a conference, held at Weissenburg, A.D. 1568, which lasted ten days, and during which the doctrine of the Trinity formed a principal subject of discussion, he approved of the opinion of those, who believe, that the Supreme God is one essence in one person, namely the Father; and that his only Son was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. From that time to the present, Unitarians have stood upon the same footing, with regard to political rights, in Transylvania, as Catholics, Lutherans, and members of the Reformed Church; and one Prothonotary, according to the constitution, must still be a Unitarian. They have also had a regular succession of Superintendents, or Bishops, of whom the first was the unfortunate Francis Davidis.

VIDEND. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. ii. p. 170. *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 213. Mon. Rep. Vol. XV. p. 193.

59.

NICHOLAS SIENICIUS, (*Polon.* SIENICKI,) a Polish Knight, was Arch-chamberlain of Chelm, and is commonly called

“the Polish Demosthenes.” In the Diet of Petricow, held in 1565, he was Director of the Equestrian Order of Delegates, or President of the Lower House; and in a Conference with the orthodox, on the subject of the Trinity, which was held at the same place, he was the Interlocutor of the Unitarian party. Sandius observes, that his opinions concerning the person of Christ nearly resembled those of Gonesius and Cazanovius. He was the author of A Collection of the Acts of the Kingdom and the Church, which was preserved in manuscript at Zamosc after his death.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 49. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 833.

60.

JOHN NIEMOJEVIUS, (*Polon.* NIEMOJEWSKI; sometimes called NIEMOIOVIUS in the Synodical Acts, and the “Bibliotheca” of Sandius,) was a Polish Knight, and Judge of the territory of Inowladislavia, which office he voluntarily relinquished, on joining the Unitarian Church. This disinterested conduct was in strict unison with his general character; for, though tenacious of the opinions which he had embraced, and impatient of contradiction, no one was ever more ready to avow and defend what he believed to be the truth. Faustus Socinus, in a letter addressed to him, March 20th, 1587, says, “Since, as it must be clear to yourself, our brethren deservedly hold you in the highest esteem, and your influence among us both publicly and privately is very considerable, I adjure you before God and Christ, that it may not be owing to you, if all salutary truth do not shine forth, and open upon us all; but that you will use your endeavours, that elsewhere, and particularly in the Synods, the questions, chiefly connected with religious truth, may be proposed and examined with calmness and love; not for the sake of condemning any particular doctrine, as has been preposterously done in the Church hitherto, but

for the sake of discovering the truth, and of retaining it when found. Nor be so much shocked, I pray you, when you hear anything affirmed contrary to your opinion, and that of the majority, before it is first understood, and the force of the reasons and proofs duly weighed; especially as you have already learnt by experience, that you have at first started back with horror from those propositions, which you have afterwards cordially embraced." (F. Socini Opera, T. I. p. 402, col. 1.)

Niemojevius was among the chief disputants against the doctrine of the Trinity, in the Conference held at Petricow in 1565. At first he defended the preëxistence of Christ against the other Unitarians; but he afterwards went over to the opinion of the Racovians, or that of Socinus. He died at Lublin on the 8th of March, 1598. His writings, according to Bock, were eleven in number.

In his reply to a work, entitled "The Curb," and written by Powodowski, Canon of Posnania, he openly avows himself a Socinian, and expresses his conviction, that the received views concerning the person of Christ are not founded in Scripture, but borrowed from the writings of Athanasius, Cyril and Augustin. From John viii. he endeavours to shew, that all the declarations concerning the One God in the Old Testament refer to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ alone, and not to a Trinity of persons in the divine essence. He expresses doubts respecting the ascription of divine honour to the Saviour; and denies that there is any superiority of nature in the person of Christ. He strives to shew, likewise, that Infant Baptism has no foundation in Scripture. This reply of Niemojevius was printed by Alexius Rodecki, A.D. 1583, in 4to.

In another work, written in answer to the so-called "Lamp" of Canon Powodowski, Niemojevius altogether denies the deity of Christ, and says, "Christ is a man, and

not God; for God does not stand in need of baptism. After he was dead, he returned to life, which cannot be said of one represented as God, but may of one who was truly man." Of the Holy Ghost he says, "Christians neither knew him, nor believed in him, for three hundred years after the times of the Apostles: the words, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost,' may be admitted for the sake of peace, as they can do no harm to the Christian faith; but the Holy Ghost is not therefore God, or the third person of the deity." He further says, "As no other Son of God existed before the man Jesus, so he had no glory before he became man."

It was at the request of Niemojevius, that Faustus Socinus wrote his work "On the seventh Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans." (F. Socini Opera, T. I. p. 87.) This was first printed at Cracow, in 1583, with a letter of Niemojevius on this exposition, and Socinus's answer to this letter; and again at Racow, in 1612, 8vo. The question on which that disputation turns is, Whether the Apostle speaks in his own person, now renewed by the spirit of Christ, or not? Niemojevius supported the affirmative side of the question; but at length, convinced by the arguments of Socinus, retracted his sentiments, and afterwards espoused and defended the negative. Dr. Toulmin, who alludes to this fact, in his "Memoirs of Faustus Socinus," (Chap. iv. p. 328,) adds, "The mention of this work reminds me of a striking occurrence, relative to the controversy about the sense of this chapter. The sentiments of Socinus on the subject were warmly debated in the Synod of Lublin, 1589. Some defended them, but a greater number of Ministers opposed them. One of these, whose name was Nicholas Zitinius, was requested to explain the chapter in a manner different from Socinus, and accordingly argued the matter strongly: but, coming to the words in which the Apostle gives God thanks on account of his

deliverance, he stood stock still like one astonished, and then recovering himself said, ‘What is this deliverance? What is the benefit which called forth such grateful acknowledgments from the Apostle? Was it that he was necessarily detained in so great a servitude of sin? I can by no means approve of this notion. I therefore,’ said he, ‘in like manner, give thanks to the Father of lights, that it hath pleased him that the light of truth should arise upon my mind, which is now freed from error.’ He immediately adopted, and skilfully defended the opposite explanation: when they, whose cause he undertook, were amazed and reproved him, he answered, that he could not resist the convictions of his judgment. This event greatly contributed to the propagation of the sentiments of Socinus on this point.”

In addition to Niemojevius’s two replies to Powodowski, and the part which he took in the controversy about Rom. vii., Bock enumerates the following.

1. A Disputation with a Jesuit, held at Lublin in 1581. In this Disputation, Niemojevius took part with Martin Czechovicus, in the Church of the Jesuits. They were opposed by the Priests, Warszycius and Jodocus, and by the Dominican, Severinus.

2. A Reply, in the Polish Language, to the Latin Theses of Emanuel Vega on Transubstantiation. These Theses were entitled, “*Assertiones Theologicæ de Eucharistiæ Sacramento.* Antw. Plantin. 1586,” 4to. Faustus Socinus wrote some Animadversions on Niemojevius’s Reply to Vega, which may be found in his short treatise, “On the Lord’s Supper.” (*Socini Opera*, T. I. p. 768.) Even at that time Niemojevius’s Reply appears to have been very rare.

3. A Letter to George Schomann on Faustus Socinus’s treatise, “On the Use and Object of the Lord’s Supper.” March 8th, 1588. Of this Letter, which was written in the

Polish language, a Latin translation was inserted by F. Socinus in the above mentioned treatise, (Opera, T. I. pp. 756—766,) together with his own reply.

4. Two Letters to F. Socinus on the Sacrifice and Invocation of Christ. The former of these was written Feb. 28th, 1587; the latter, April 28th, in the same year. They were inserted in F. Socinus's work, entitled, "*Breves de diversis Materiis ad Religionem Christianam pertinentibus Tractatus*," &c., together with Socinus's two Replies, dated March 20th, and May 20th, 1587. (Socini Opera, T. I. pp. 465—488.)

5. Reply to part of Socinus's Disputation "*De J. C. Servatore*." This was written in Polish, and translated into Latin by George Schomann. Socinus's rejoinder may be seen in his Works, T. I. p. 444.

6. A Proof that the Papal Church is neither Apostolic, nor Holy, nor One, nor Catholic; together with a Reply to the Calumnies of Caspar Wilkovius. *Polon.*

7. An Oration addressed to Sigismund III., King of Poland. This Oration contains an expostulation and complaint concerning the overthrow of the Church at Cracow, in 1591.

8. A Disputation held at Levartow, in 1592, with Hadrian Radziminski, the Jesuit, who had proposed Theses against the Ebionites, Samosatenians and Arians, proving, that Jesus Christ was not only true Man, but true God; and also against the Sacramentarians, on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; which were opposed by Albert Calissius, Rector of Levartow; Gregory, Minister of Levartow; Francis Kurowski; and John Niemojevius. Sandius ascribes this writing to Albert Calissius (B. A. p. 94); but Daniel Clementinus, to whom, as Bock says, it ought to be best known, (Hist. Ant. T. I. P. i. p. 554,) expressly mentions Niemojevius as the author.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B.A. pp. 49, 50. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 548—554. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Altorf. Supplem. p. 1169. *Socini Opera*, T. I. p. 115. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. iii. Sect. i. pp. 157—160. 328. 331, etc.

61.

MARTIN CZECHOVICIUS, (*Polon.* CZECHOWICZ,) was a Pole or a Lithuanian, and author of a schism in the Socianian Church, occasioned by his vehement opposition to Infant Baptism. The first mention which we find of him is on the 16th of September, 1561, as the bearer of a letter from Calvin to the Synod of Cracow, warning the members of the Reformed Church to beware of Blandrata. At this time he was Chaplain to the Prince Radzivil, Palatine of Wilna; but he afterwards officiated publicly, in his ministerial capacity, at Cujavia, and at Lublin. While at the latter place, he was deposed by the Synod, March 8th, 1598, for exciting disputes on the subjects of Arianism and Baptism. He is represented, in the Synodical Acts, as seeking to be exempted from the duties of the ministerial office, on account of his want of strength to discharge them in an efficient manner: but it has been supposed, that he made this request, in anticipation of the Synod's sentence of deposition. Christopher Lubieniecius, who had previously been Minister at Levartow, was appointed his successor, with Valentine Smalcus as a coadjutor.

Czechovicius was at first a believer in the præexistence of Christ; but about the year 1570, he abandoned that doctrine, with Niemojewius and several others, and embraced the opinion of the Pinezovians. The following account of his opinions is given by Count Krasinski, in his "Sketch of the Reformation in Poland."—"He maintained that it was not God who was made man, but that man was made God, and that Jesus Christ did not exist before he was born of the Virgin; that he was a man similar to the rest

of mankind, except that he was without sin; that he was conceived like other men, but was called the 'Son of God' because he was prepared by God through the Holy Ghost in the womb of his mother; and that he was made Lord of all things, that he might save and give eternal life to such as he pleased. Jesus Christ was therefore to be worshipped. Czechowicz attacked those who refused to adore Jesus Christ, and designated them by the appellation of half-Jews, '*semi-Judaizantes*,' a term which has since been generally adopted. He admitted miracles and the evidence of the prophets who predicted the advent of our Saviour, as also that justification was only to be obtained by faith, and that works had but a subordinate merit. His opinions respecting worldly authorities were moderate, and he only recommended the refusal of obedience to them when they commanded actions contrary to the word of God. He recommended a patient endurance of injuries, and abstinence from seeking redress, either personally or by recurring to the authorities, and maintained that a Christian should neither accept worldly offices nor make use of arms." Ruarus, in a letter addressed to Abraham Calovius from Dantzic, in the year 1638, says, "Martin Czechovicus thought with us," (that is, with the Socinians,) "concerning God and Christ; with the Mennonites on the subject of Baptism; and on other subjects, if I mistake not, with the school of Calvin." He wrote much, and laboured in various ways to found a school of his own, but did not succeed in establishing a complete religious system.

Sandius was in error, in supposing that he died at Lublin, in 1608; and the error has been repeated by Lauterbach. We learn from Smalcius's Diary, that the death of Czechovicus took place in the month of November, 1613; and the statement is accompanied by a memorandum to the effect, that his followers had greatly diminished in

numbers before that time. When near his end, he exhorted those, who still clung to him, to remain steadfast to *the Minor Church*, by which Lubieniecious supposes him to mean the *Unitarian*, as opposed to the *Calvinistic*, from which they had originally separated. But Bock thinks, that he meant his own section of the Unitarian Church, as opposed to that of Socinus, from which it principally differed on the subjects of Baptism and Justification. On this point, however, Bock was unquestionably mistaken; for *the Minor Church*, among writers on ecclesiastical affairs connected with Poland and Lithuania, always means the Unitarian, as opposed to the Calvinistic, or to that branch of the Reformed Church, which received the Helvetic Confession, and which, on account of its superior numbers, was called *the Greater Church*.

The following is a list of Czechovicus's writings.

1. On the Origin of the Errors of the Pædobaptists, &c. Printed by Theophilus Adamides (a feigned name for Alexis Rodecki); 4to. pp. 201. This work has no date, or place of publication, or author's name; but the Dedictory Epistle to John Kiszka was written at Lublin, April 7th, 1575. The number of presumed errors which the author points out is fourteen. In an Appendix, he endeavours to shew, how grievous an error it is, to contend that Baptism is useless and unnecessary for those, who have already believed, or who were born of Christian parents; and strives to refute those, who deem an observance of the Lord's Supper unimportant, as well as those, who say, that to persons who partake of it, there is no need of external Water Baptism.

2. A Translation of the New Testament into the Polish Language, with Various Readings in the Margin. Alex. Rodecki [Racow]. 1577.

3. Explanation of the First Chapter of John. *Polon.*

4. Objections to Faustus Socinus's Explanation of the Beginning of John's Gospel.

5. Christian Conversations, or Dialogues. Alex. Rodecki. 1575, 4to. These Dialogues relate to what their author deems the primary articles of the Christian faith; and were intended, by him, to serve as a kind of larger Catechism. It was in reply to them, that the Canon Powodowski published his work, entitled "Wenzidlo," or "The Curb." Both were in Polish; and John Niemojewius undertook a defence of Czechovicius in the same language.

6. Decision against Paul Gilowski's Explanation of the Catechism. Alexander Turobinczyk (that is, Alexius Rodecki). 1581, 4to. This also is in Polish. It is preceded by a Dedication, from the pen of Stanislaus Taszycki, addressed to Stanislaus Szafraniec, Castellan of Sandomir, and dated Lislawice, January 20th, 1581. The charges which the author brings against Gilowski are, that he accuses others of that of which he is himself guilty; that he labours to establish that of which he confesses himself ignorant; that he does not understand the Hebrew names of God; that he unreasonably charges the newly-baptized with error respecting God; that he is inconsistent with himself; and that he quotes Scripture falsely and imperfectly. Against these charges Gilowski defended himself in a work, the third edition of which was printed in 1605.

7. Reply to a Piece of Stanislaus Farnovius, in which that writer endeavours to set aside the Pacification of Luclavice. 1581, 4to. *Polon.* This little work is ushered in by a Preface from the pen of Florian Morstinus; and was intended to serve as an Appendix to No. 6. Its author proposes to weaken the arguments of Farnovius in favour of the existence of Christ before his conception of Mary. On John i. 14, he remarks, that it is an old papal

figment, that God became man; because if he had been truly God before, but afterwards became truly man or flesh, he would have ceased to be what he was before.

8. A Conference of three Days on certain Articles of Faith, but especially on Infant Baptism; written at Nieswicz, and dedicated to Prince Nicholas Radzivil, January 6th, 1565. Rabbi Isaac Ben Abraham quotes this "Conference" in "Chissuk Emuna."

9. On Pædobaptism, a brief Narrative concerning the Origin of the Dispute, and the Attempt to gloss over the first Sacrament, that is the Sacrament of Baptism, in the Grand Dukedom of Lithuania, and afterwards in Poland. [1565.]

10. A Vindication of his Dialogues against James, the Jew, of Belzyce. 1581. *Polon.*

11. A small Mirror for Christian Women, in which they may see themselves, as regards the Discharge of their Christian Duties. 1582, 4to. Theoph. Adamowitz. *Polon.* The name of the author does not appear in the title-page, but is disclosed in the Dedication, which is addressed to two young women of noble family. Sandius has not noticed this work, which is divided into three parts. The first relates to the Word of God, its preëminence, certainty and perfection; the second, to the One God, and his only Son, the man Christ Jesus; and the third, to the duties of Christians towards God, and Christ, and their fellow-men. On the work of Redemption considered in itself, of which the author treats in the third part, he writes like one of the orthodox, so that Daniel Clementinus appeals to Czechovicus on this subject, against the rest of the Socinians.

12. The Disputation of John Niemojevius and Martin Czechovicus, held at Lublin, in the Church of the Jesuits, with the Priests, Warszycius and Jodocus, &c., in the year 1581. *Polon. MS.*

13. Explanation of the seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, which Czechovicius proposed first to the Brethren at Dantzic, and afterwards to the Synod assembled at Wengrow in 1584.

14. A Letter, written in the Name of the whole Synod of Chmielnik, September 13th, 1586, to the Magistrate of Goslar, in the Cause of Ostorod, and signed by Czechovicius, Rebnicius, Paul ab Orgente, John Laurentius, and others.

15. Illustration of the Lublin Articles, which P. Radzinski exhibited about the year 1592. *Polon.* In this treatise, as Dan. Clementinus informs us, Czechovicius says, that “Christ did not receive his power, and supreme dominion, till he had accomplished the will of God, and was raised from the dead, and placed at God’s right hand;” and that “the glory of Christ was in the Father’s keeping, but that he received it at the appointed time.”

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 50—52. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 217—237. *Ruari* Epistolæ, Cent. i. N. 46. *Smalcii* Diarium, apud *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf., pp. 1169. 1200. De Typographiis Unitariorum in Polon. et Lithuan., apud *Sandii* B. A. p. 201. *Stoinii* Epitome, p. 185. *Krasinski’s* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Ch. xiv. pp. 360—362.

62.

STANISLAÛS FARNOVIUS or PHARNOVIUS, (*Polon.* FAR-
NOWSKI,) sometimes called FARNESIUS or FERNESIUS, studied in the German Universities, and principally at Heidelberg; and was very early in life distinguished as a disseminator of Arianism. Zachariah Ursinus relates, that certain Divines held conferences with him; and that he was afterwards ordered to quit Heidelberg.

He held the doctrine of Christ’s preëxistence; and from his name, those who embraced the same doctrine were called FARNOVIANS. Whether he believed in the person-

ality of the Holy Spirit has been disputed. Sandius thinks that he did not: Bock is of opinion that he did. But in whatever way this question may be decided, it is certain, that Farnovius and his followers thought it wrong to invoke, or offer up prayers to the Holy Spirit.

He was an advocate of Adult Baptism: but, disagreeing with the other Unitarians respecting the person of Christ, he separated from them, and drew after him many followers. The lenity and indulgence of the more heterodox party, however, together with the skill with which they conducted the controversy, won back considerable numbers; so that, at length, the whole body, being deprived of its head, ceased to exist, and was in time reduced to nothing. "*Tenuēs abierunt in auras.*" The few, who did not join the Unitarians, went over to the Calvinistic party. Farnovius's own secession from the Unitarians, who were then called PINCZOVIANs, took place about the year 1568. After that time, he had the charge of a congregation at Sandecz, on the confines of Hungary, under the patronage of Stanislaus Mezeck, or Menzynski, Starost of that town. He also had the strenuous support of Taszycki, an influential noble, who became a convert to his opinions. His other principal followers were Stanislaus Wisnovius, John Cazanovius, Nicholas Zytno, and a lady of the name of Zabawska.

Farnovius was living in the year 1614. Smalcus states, in his "Diary," that he held a conference with him, on the 31st of January in that year, at Zarsyn, which ended, as so many conferences have done, both before and since, in each party being more confirmed in his own opinions. Lauterbach thinks that Farnovius died in 1615. But Bock regards it as more probable, that he survived Smalcus, who lived to a very great age; else Smalcus, as he thinks, would have recorded the time of his death.

The following works have been attributed to Farnovius.

1. A Book of Prayers in the Polish language, which was published at the expense of Zabawski's widow, a matron belonging to the author's Church, of whom frequent mention is made in the Synodical Acts.

2. A Proof of the falsifying, and a Confession of the true Doctrine. *Polon.* Sandius is doubtful whether this work was written by Farnovius, or Gonesius, or Wisnovius; or whether it was the joint production of all three.

3. Books against the Pacification of Luclavice, inscribed to Stanislaus Szafraniec, Castellan of Sandomir. In these books Farnovius combats the opinion of those, who deny that the Son of God existed before he was born of Mary. Martin Czechovicius, as we have already seen, published a reply to them, in the year 1584, which he had prepared about five years before.

4. Genuine Instruction concerning Christian Discipline in the true Church of the Son of God, arranged and harmonized from the Evidence of the New Testament alone, by Stan. Farnovius, Minister of a Christian Church. 1573, 4to. *Polon.* This work consists wholly of extracts from the New Testament. In the Preface, which is addressed "to all the Faithful," the author treats of the internal and external characters of the Apostolic Church; and the treatise itself contains admonitions to Pastors and Ministers, and the whole Church, with an account of such things as it is incumbent upon each order to do or to leave undone.

5. On the Knowledge and Confession of the Only God through all Time, Creator of all Things; and of his Only Son, by whom all Things exist; and of the Only Spirit of God, by whom the converted cry, "Abba, Father!" &c. 1573, 4to. *Polon.* This work is upon the same plan as the preceding, and consists chiefly of texts of Scripture,

systematically arranged. No printer's name, or place of publication is mentioned. Prefixed to the body of the book is "An Address to the Poles." In this the author treats of the state of heathen unbelief, in which the Polish nation was once sunk, and the Antichristian superstition, by which it was still oppressed; and under the latter head he includes the doctrine of the Trinity, and Infant Baptism. He gives it as his opinion, that Jews and Turks are nearer the Kingdom of God than orthodox Christians; because those who take the Jewish Scriptures, or the Koran, as their sole guide, confess One God, and err only in not having access to him by a Mediator, not believing that he is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, while Trinitarian Christians deny the Unity of God, by joining three in one. He compares them, therefore, to the worshipers of a multiplicity of Gods, as Jupiter, Pluto, Mars, &c. His treatise commences with an explanation of the words *Elohim*, *Jehovah* and *Adonai*; and he thinks that the plural form, *Elohim*, is used for the sake of expressing honour. He grants that Christ is the Lord *Jehovah*, yet not of himself, but of the only *Jehovah*, whose Son he is. He strenuously opposes the doctrine of the Trinity, contending that its advocates, whom he calls *Ousians*, must either make the Father, Son and Holy Spirit three persons, of which each must be God by himself, thus constituting three Gods; or three Gods in name only, which is Sabellianism; or three parts of the same Deity, of which any one without the other is not God, but all three constitute the divine essence. Near the end of the book is a threefold Form of Confession, expressed in scriptural phraseology alone, concerning God the Father, his only Son, and the Holy Spirit; to which are subjoined two Forms of Prayer,—one addressed to the only God, the other to the Son of God, the Saviour, our God and Lord; and two Hymns, one to God the Father, and the other to the Son

of God. Of the Holy Spirit he says, that, “although he is a living Spirit, Scripture nowhere declares that he is Jehovah, or God; and does not command us to believe in him, or to invoke him.” He observes, that, “on this subject, we have no revelation, and no example.”

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 52, 53. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 334—340. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. viii. p. 220. *Smalcii* Diar. p. 1201. *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 213. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vita Wissowatii, apud *Sandii* B. A. p. 226. *Moshemii* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. Cap. iv. § xxiv. p. 724. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 358—360.

63.

STANISLAÛS WISNOVIUS, (*Polon.* WISZNOWSKI,) a Polish Arian, and the friend and adherent of Stanislaüs Farnovius, was Pastor of the Church at Luclavice. Of this Church Stanislaüs Taszycki was the patron; but he afterwards quitted the ministry of Wisnovius, and joined the Socinian party.

Wisnovius published a work in the Polish language, in 4to., entitled, “A Dialogue on the sincere Knowledge of God the Father, his Son, and the Holy Spirit;” with a Preface addressed “to the Faithful,” and written at Luclavice, Feb. 26th, 1575.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 53. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 1008, 1009.

64.

STANISLAÛS PACLESIIUS, (*Polon.* PAKLEWSKI,) a Pole, was Pastor of the Church at Lublin, where he died on the 26th of February, 1565. The patron of this Church was Tenczynski, Palatine of Belsk, and Starost of Lublin. Otvinovius, in his “Christian Heroes,” relates, that Paclesius was among the first of those, who inveighed against the Trinity and Infant Baptism; and that his opinions

were afterwards illustrated and confirmed by others. His last will, dated 1565, is quoted by Martin Czechovicius, in his treatise on the origin of Pædobaptism.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 53. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 582, 583. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. viii. p. 152; L. iii. C. iii. p. 176.

65.

JOHN FALCONIUS was a Pole or Lithuanian, of the noble and ancient family of the Falconii. The surname of this family, (in Polish, SOKOŁOWICZ, or SOKOŁOWSKI, and IASTRZEMSKI,) is derived from the Latin *Falco*, and denotes a *Falcon*. They have a falcon in the family arms.

John Falconius was Catechist, and Master of a School in Biala, a town of Podlachia, and in the Church of Bychawa; and afterwards Minister of a Church at Mordy, in the same Palatinate. He was a different person from John Falconius, a Physician of Hameln, who died Nov. 26th, 1586. He held the same opinions as Gonesius, who converted him from Trinitarianism. Wengerscius says, that he retracted his opinions in the Synod of the Bohemian Brethren, held in 1588, but afterwards defended them again. The same author informs us, that he wrote an account of the Lithuanian Churches.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 54. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 331, 332.

66.

THOMAS FALCONIUS, a Lithuanian, was induced to abandon the Trinitarian faith by George Blandrata. Lubieniecius reckons him among the earliest of the Polish reformers. He was at first a novice in the Cathedral Church of Lublin, and in the year 1566 Minister of the Church of Kleck, under Prince Nicholas Radzivil. Some account of him is given in Erasmus Otvinovius's "Chris-

tian Heroes." This work was originally written in Polish verse; and extracts from it were made by Benedict Wisowatius, and published in Latin, at the end of Wenger-scius's "History of the Slavonian Reformation. Amst. 1679," 4to. We learn from this account, that, on embracing Protestantism, Thomas Falconius was thrown into prison, but remained steadfast to the new principles which he had adopted; and that, after his liberation, he was appointed Chaplain to Prince Nicholas Radzivil. He is said to have assisted Simon Budnæus, in translating the Bible into the Polish language. His works were as follow.

1. The Acts and Sayings of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, recorded for the lasting Solace of God's Elect, by Witnesses and Writers ordained of God, and illustrated by brief explanatory Notes. This work, which was in the Polish language, and is called "a Harmony of the Evangelists" by Sandius and Lubieniecius, was not properly a Monotessaron; but a narrative of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, compiled from the synoptical Gospels alone; to which was added a separate commentary on the Gospel of John. The author thinks, that the evangelical narratives were not written in chronological order.

2. The latter Book of St. Luke, called "The History" or "Acts of the Apostles," with brief explanatory Notes. This was written upon the same plan as the preceding, and both were printed at Brzesk, in Lithuania, in the year 1566.

3, 4. Two Letters to the Synod of Brzeziny, on the subject of Baptism. 1565. *MSS.*

5. A Polish Song, which acquired great popularity, and was inserted in many Collections, is also attributed to Thomas Falconius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 54. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 332—334. *Lubieniecii* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. i. C. v. p. 20; L. ii. C. ii. p. 43.

67.

Prince NICHOLAS RADZIVIL, Palatine of Wilna, and Grand Marshal and Chancellor of Lithuania, was first cousin of Barbara Radzivil, Queen of Poland, and one of the earliest, and most illustrious, as well as consistent patrons of the Reformation in that country. He travelled, in his youth, into most parts of Europe; and was so skilful in bodily exercises, that he surpassed, in this respect, all the gentlemen of his time. His fame as a warrior was also great. He was Captain of the Guards of Sigismund Augustus, and commanded his armies three times in Livonia, where he gained a signal victory over the Germans, which deprived them of this province, and rendered it subject to Poland. But he was distinguished most of all for his strenuous advocacy of the grand principles of the Reformation. When the Protestant clergy were excluded from the pulpits, in which they had been accustomed to officiate, he accommodated them with a place of meeting in his own court-yard, and himself attended their religious services. Lippomani, the Pope's Nuncio, hearing of this, addressed a letter to him, in which, after having referred to many reports of his heresy, he asked him, whether there was any truth in these reports. "Public rumour," says he, "asserts, that the Palatine of Wilna patronizes all heresies, and that all the dangerous innovators are gathering under his protection; that he erects, wherever his influence reaches, sacrilegious altars against the altar of God, and that he establishes pulpits of falsehood against the pulpits of truth." The Nuncio adds, after alluding to various other reports of a similar kind, that, if the Prince would only abandon his heresy, and return to the pale of the Church, he would be the most perfect of men, as he is possessed of every other conceivable good quality, and is deficient only in true religion.

Of this patronizer of all heresies, and protector of all dangerous innovators, who bade defiance alike to the Nuncio and the Pope himself, Lubieniecius justly remarks, that, "in propagating the truth, according to the light which he possessed, he was second to none." Martin Czechovicius and Simon Budnæus, who were distinguished by their early advocacy of the proper Unitarian doctrine, were his chaplains. When Calvin wrote to the Polish Reformers, advising them not to trust Blandrata, not only did the Synod of Wilna receive the advice with displeasure, but the Prince Radzivil, who was presiding over its deliberations, expressed his dissatisfaction at Calvin's interference, and was so far from treating Blandrata with harshness, that he entrusted him, as his representative, with full powers, to the Synod of Pinczow, in 1561.

A Synod of the Calvinistic party having been convened at Cracow on the 14th of May, 1563, which denounced the Antitrinitarian doctrines, another was held by the Unitarian party at Mordy, in Podlachia, on the 6th of June, in the same year, with the consent of Prince Nicholas Radzivil, at which forty-two Ministers attended, who signed a Confession, avowing their disbelief in the Divinity of Christ. At this Synod, many inveighed strongly against the doctrine of the Trinity; but some who were more timid, and fearful of alarming the consciences of the weak, thought that the period had not arrived for an open disavowal of that doctrine. The Synod, therefore, in recording its decision, which was transmitted to Prince Nicholas Radzivil, accompanied it with these explanatory words. "*Vocabulum Trinitatis etsi non omnino rejicere potuimus, propter aliquos infirmiores, maximâ tamen ex parte præsentis abusu, illud purgavimus, ut nunc utpote verbum hominis et non divinum, minus valoris quam antea apud multos obtinuerit.*"

In the same year, Bernardine Ochinus published his

celebrated "Dialogues," the nineteenth and twentieth of which, relating chiefly to the Trinity, were dedicated to Prince Nicholas Radzivil. It appears, however, from a letter, which the Prince himself wrote to Calvin, at the beginning of the next year, that the copy intended for him had not reached its destination. In this letter he writes as follows. "They say, that not long ago certain Dialogues were published by Bernardine Ochlinus, a man most eminent for his Christian piety, who, in these Dialogues of his, criticizes and finds fault with what the old schoolmen taught concerning this dogma; but this book, though dedicated to us, we have hitherto not read, or even seen. It is reported, that these Dialogues were sent to us, but that they have been studiously intercepted by some person, in order that they may not find their way from Germany into Poland."

To diffuse as widely as possible the liberal sentiments which he cherished, this truly magnanimous Prince established a printing-press at Brest, in Lithuania; and one of the works which issued from it was a translation of the whole Bible into the Polish language, which was prepared under his own auspices, and printed at his sole expense. This version, which was the first Protestant one that issued from a Polish press, made its appearance in the year 1563; and most of the translators were Unitarians, as will be seen from the following list, containing such of the names as have come down to our times. John a Lasco, Francis Stancarus, Bernardine Ochlinus, Simon Zacius, — Orsacius, Francis Lismaninus, Peter Statorius, George Schomann, George Blandrata, John Paul Aleciati, Martin Crovicius, Gregory Pauli, Peter Brelius, Alexander Vitrelinus, Andrew Tricesius, and James of Lublin. This version, which, as far as regards the Old Testament, was much extolled by the Jews, came into general use in the Protestant Churches,

and particularly those of Lithuania; yet it is said, that, in the mode of rendering some passages, a Unitarian bias is shewn, and Ringeltaube, in his “*Nachricht von den Polischen Bibeln*,” has endeavoured to shew that such is the case. Instances of this kind must, however, be very rare, and of a very unimportant and harmless nature, to have escaped the vigilance of the orthodox Reformed Churches in Poland. The Rev. T. F. Dibdin, in his “*Bibliotheca Spenceriana*,” has the following remarks respecting this Bible. “Clement, in the IVth volume of his *Bibliothèque Curieuse*, p. 190-2, has availed himself of the aid of Ringeltaube; from whom we learn that Prince Radziwil was the liberal patron of this publication; that he procured a printer of the name of Woiewodky, to come from Cracow to Pinczow, a small adjoining town, where nearly twenty learned men (whose names are enumerated by Ringeltaube) laboured for six years at the present translation. During the whole time they were generously maintained by Radziwil; who, moreover, defrayed the expences of the publication, which amounted to 3000 ducats. Although the Polish Prince was at the head of the then sect of Socinians, yet as their separation from the Reformed Church did not take place till 1565, the present version is equally claimed by the Reformists. Melchior Adam, in his *Lives of the German Lawyers*, gives us some account of this version; copies of which (he says) were bought and burnt *malitiâ adversariorum*, ‘c’est là (observes Clement) le meilleur moien de pousser un livre à la dernière rareté.’ Janozki, more than 60 years ago, pronounced a copy of it to be worth a hundred crowns. Schellhorn, Freytag, Vogt and Bauer are only transcripts of the preceding authorities. De Bure speaks of the most perfect known copy of it, in the Emperor’s library at Vienna; with which, in fact, the present perfect copy has been collated. He is unjust in

dispraising the type and wood-cuts; as the bad quality of the paper only produces the rude aspect of the pages: Bibl. Instruct. Vol. I. No. 79. Peignot is laconic, but interesting: Dict. des Livres condamnés, supprimés, ou censurés; Vol. II. p. 67. He notices a copy in the public library at Stuttgard. Another is in the Duke of Brunswick's library. The Bishop of Ely had one nearly perfect. The noble owner of the present copy was obliged to give 100 guineas for two imperfect copies, to render his own complete."

The pious efforts of Prince Radzivil to diffuse among his countrymen the pure word of God, were zealously seconded by his lady, Elizabeth Szydlowiecki; but his sons, after his death, which took place in the year 1567, all returned to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church; and one of them, who was named Nicholas, after his father, but was a most unworthy representative of that good and great man, collected, at a considerable expense, all the copies of his father's Bible which he could procure, and caused them to be publicly burnt in the market-place at Wilna. This fanatic performed a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Another son, George, entered the Church, and became a Cardinal. The remaining two, Albert and Stanislaus, occupied civil posts of eminence in their native country.

VIDEND. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. i. C. v. p. 33; L. ii. C. iv. p. 64; C. vi. pp. 126. 129; L. iii. C. i. p. 167; C. ii. p. 170. *Calvini* Epistolæ, N. 202. *Schomanni* Testam. p. 194. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. p. 517. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Chap. xv. p. 563. Gen. Mag. Sept. 1814, p. 243. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Part. ii. Chap. vi. pp. 307—312; Chap. viii. p. 355; Vol. II. Chap. xiii. pp. 318—320. *Bayle*, Diet. Hist. et Crit. Art. RADZIWIL.

68.

Lady BARBARA, wife of KISZKA, Palatine of Witepsk,

and mother of John Kiszka, of Ciechanowicz, is included by Sandius in his Catalogue of Unitarian writers, because she addressed a letter to the Synod of Brzeziny, on the subject of Baptism. This subject, which excited considerable discussion among the Unitarian body, was decided at the Synod of Wengrow, held on Christmas-day, 1565. This Synod consisted of forty-seven Ministers, and eighteen Nobles, besides a great number of persons of inferior rank; and has been regarded as one of the most important of the Antitrinitarian assemblies. "It was acknowledged," says Count Krasinski, "by the Churches of the districts of Szydlowietz, Lublin, Chelm and Brest, and the Synod of the Churches of the Carpathian Mountains sent to it its full powers. A letter of the Transylvanian Churches was publicly read, and many individuals belonging to the first families joined on that occasion the anti-Trinitarian Churches. We may mention among them Barbara, Lady to Kizska, Palatine of Witepsk, and Anne, Princess Radziwill. The Synod rejected the baptism of infants, on the plea that it was neither used by the primitive Church, nor commanded by the Gospels; but it did not positively prohibit it, and left it to the conscience of individuals, recommending charity and mutual forbearance." (Sketch of the Reformation in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. viii. pp. 361, 362.)

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 54. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 425. *Lubieniecki* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. iii. p. 179. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, l. c.

69.

Princess ANNE RADZIVIL, like the Lady Barbara Kiszka, has been honoured with a place in Sandius's "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*," and for a similar reason; namely, because she addressed a letter to the Synod of Brzeziny on the subject of Baptism, which was, as we have just seen,

an absorbing topic among the Antitrinitarians of Poland, and the neighbouring countries. This Synod was held in the year 1565; and at that of Wengrow, towards the close of the same year, these two noble ladies enrolled themselves as members of that section of the Antitrinitarian Church, which discountenanced Pædobaptism.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 54. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch, &c. ubi supra.

70.

NICHOLAS ZYTNIUS, (*Polon.* ZYTNO,) was one of the Collocutors appointed by the Arian party, at the Conference of Skrzynna, in 1567. At the Synod of Lublin, in 1589, he contended strenuously at first against Socinus's interpretation of Rom. vii., but towards the close of his speech, (*vide Art.* 60,) made a sudden pause; confessed his inability to interpret the Apostle's words, ver. 25, in accordance with his own previously expressed sentiments; and concluded by avowing himself a convert to the interpretation of Socinus. He is sometimes called Zytinski.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 1044, 1045.

71.

MATTHIAS ALBINUS, (or ALBIN,) Minister at Ivanovitze, acknowledged the Supremacy of the Father, and denied the preëxistence of Christ, but differed from many of the Pinczovians on the subject of Pædobaptism, and united with Czechovicius and others in discountenancing the practice of baptizing infants. It has been said that he was the first among the Polish Protestants, who administered baptism by immersion. At the Synod of Skrzynna, in 1567, he was associated with Gregory Pauli, George Schomann, and others, as an opponent of the Arian party. The Rev. R. Robinson, in his "Ecclesiastical Researches," says, that

Matthias Albinus continued a Trinitarian till his death; but Bock has included him in his supplementary list of Antitrinitarians, and Sandius, from the connexion in which he mentions him, evidently regarded him as a Humanitarian.

VIDEND. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Ch. viii. p. 361. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1070. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Ch. xv. p. 580. *Sandii* B. A. p. 48.

72.

DANIEL BIELINSCIUS, (*Polon.* BIELINSKI,) was present at the Synod of Skrzynna, in 1567; and, if what Bock says of him be true, defended Socinianism against those who embraced the Arian opinion concerning the person of Christ. (Hist. Antitrin. Suppl. p. 1070.) Sandius, however, mentions the name of "Daniel Bilinius," together with those of others, who contended that "the Lord Jesus Christ existed before his mother."

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1070. *Sandii* B. A. p. 49.

73.

JAMES CALINOVIVS, (*Polon.* KALINOWSKI,) was one of the first of those, who fought under the banners of Lælius Socinus in Poland. He took part against the Arians at the Synod of Skrzynna, in 1567.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1071.

74.

JEROME PHILIPOVIUS, (*Polon.* FILIPOWSKI,) must be placed among the earliest Unitarians of Poland, and their presidents and patrons, who, in the Conference held at Petricow, in 1565, strenuously defended their party. When Ochinus was on his way into Moravia, and was detained by illness at Pinczow, Philipovius kindly received him into

his house, and took care of him; for which act of humanity he is said to have expressed his obligation in these words. "I thank God, brother Philipovius, that He has rendered thee worthy of conferring a kindness upon Ochinus, in such distress!" Philipovius was afterwards a person of great influence among the members of the Unitarian Church. He assisted at the Synod of Skrzynna in 1567; and many other assemblies of the same kind. Christopher Lubieniec, Junior, married his granddaughter, Catharine Philipovia.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 630; T. II. p. 508.

75.

LAURENCE CRISCOVIUS, (*Polon.* KRISKOWSKI,) a Lithuanian Knight, passed from the Eastern, or Greek Church, to Protestantism. He was Minister of a Church at Nieswiez, in Lithuania, and afterwards of some others in the same country. Peter Gonesius, in the year 1562, addressed some remarks to him against Pædobaptism. He is not known as an Antitrinitarian author; but before he joined the Unitarians, he published, in 1558, a translation, from the Bohemian into the Polish language, of a work, "On the Safety of a quiet Conscience." He likewise assisted Simon Budnæus in his translation of Luther's Catechism into the Lithuano-Russian dialect, which was printed at Nieswiez in 1562. We learn from Sandius, that he attended the Synod at Skrzynna in 1567, in the capacity of a Notary or Scribe, on behalf of the Arian party.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 54. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 203, 204. 1071. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Ch. xiv. p. 363.

76.

SIMON BUDNÆUS, (or BUDNY,) was a native of the Duchy of Mazovia, according to Sandius; or, as Krasinski thinks,

of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. He was founder of the sect called BUDNÆANS. His distinguishing opinion was, that Jesus Christ was born in the ordinary mode of generation, and consequently was not an object of divine worship. "More dexterous," says Mosheim, "than the rest of his brethren in deducing consequences from their principles, and perceiving plainly the conclusions to which the peculiar principles of Lælius Socinus naturally led, he denied flatly all kinds of religious worship to Jesus Christ. Nor did Budnæus stop here: in order to give a more specious colour to this capital error, and to maintain it upon consistent grounds, he asserted that Christ was not begotten by any extraordinary act of divine power, but that he was born like other men, in a natural way. This hypothesis, however conformable to the fundamental principle of Socinianism, appeared intolerable and impious to the greatest part of that community."

Daniel Clementinus says, that Budnæus denied the Christian faith, and embraced Judaism; but the truth of these assertions is very questionable. It has been further said, that his notes on the Bible are those of an unbeliever, and that others of his works are subversive of revelation. But these statements also require confirmation, and seem to have been occasioned by the extreme freedom of his opinions. Whatever secret notions he may have entertained, he outwardly conformed to the Protestant religion; and there is no reason to suppose, that his writings have at any time exercised a direct influence, unfavourable to the cause of revelation. He has been regarded, however, as the precursor of the present Rationalists of Germany. That he was a man of great learning, and extraordinary sagacity, is admitted on all hands. He was for some time Chaplain to Prince Nicholas Radzivil at Kleck; and afterwards to John Kiszka, Castellan of Samogitia, at Losk,

and finally at Zaslav, in Lithuania. After having gained over a great number of proselytes to his opinions, in Lithuania and Russian Poland, he was disowned as a Minister and Brother, at the Synod of Luclavice, in 1582; and in 1584 was publicly excommunicated. He often petitioned the Synods for re-admission to communion; and is said to have been again taken into favour by the Brethren, on renouncing his obnoxious opinions. The truth of this account, however, seems to have been doubted by Bock, who represents him as seeking for re-admission, not on the ground of having changed his religious views, but because he thought, that there was no other way of getting his salary restored, which had been taken away by an act of Synod.

He took part in the controversy respecting defensive war, which was discussed with great zeal by the early Unitarians, and decided in favour of its lawfulness; and he was one of the earliest and most active opponents of Pædobaptism. The following is a list of his works.

1. A Simple Confession of the principal Articles of the Christian Faith. Losk, 1576, 8vo. *Polon.* A reply to this was published by Martin Bialobrzycki, Bishop of Camieniec, entitled, "An Orthodox Confession concerning the One God whom Catholic Christians believe, adore and invoke, taken from Scripture. Cologne, 1579," 8vo.

2. A Polish Version of the whole Bible from the Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Zaslav, 1572, 4to.; printed at the expense, and with the types of Matthias Kawieczynski, Starost of Nieswiez, by Daniel Leszczynski. Ringeltaube has given an account of this version in his "Nachricht von den Polischen Bibeln," pp. 37. 142, seqq.; and Father Simon says, that it is honourably cited, as to the Old Testament, by the Jews. (*Hist. Vers. P.* iii. p. 375. See also *Wolfii Bibl. Hebr.* Vol. I. p. 641.) It is exceedingly

rare; but there is a copy of it in the library of Sion College, London Wall.

3. The New Testament, or Books of the New Covenant, in Polish, with Annotations. Losk, 1574, 8vo. An account of this may be seen in Ringeltaube's "Nachricht," &c. pp. 37. 151.

4. A Treatise on the two Natures in Christ. 1574. To this treatise Josiah Simler published a reply, which was printed by Froschover, at Zurich, in the year 1575, 8vo. Another reply to it was written by John Wigand, and published at Berlin, in 1576, 4to.

5. A brief Demonstration that Christ is not himself God, but the Father; and why he is called God in Scripture, and moreover is God. This was appended to the preceding treatise on the two Natures of Christ.

6. A Defence of the "Simple Confession," &c. [No. 1]. Sandius has mentioned this piece, under the title "Apologia Polonica." It is quoted by its Polish title "Obrona" (Apology) in R. Isaac's "Chissuk Emuna," under the words *אויברונא* and *אויברונא*. Budnæus, in this Apology, says, that Christ is God in the same sense in which Moses was. The opinions of Budnæus, set forth in this "Apology," together with those of Czechovicus and Farnovius, were attacked by Stanislaus Zdescheki Ostrowski, Abbot of Przement, in a work "On the Trinity," published in 1591, 4to. It would seem, also, that the "Assertiones Theologicæ of the College of Posnania, concerning the Triune God, against the New Samosatenians, &c., 1581," of which Faustus Socinus wrote a refutation, were directed against Budnæus.

7. A Refutation of the Arguments of Martin Czechovicus, which he has advanced in his Dialogues, in Defence of the Opinion, that it is not lawful for a Christian Man to bear the Office of a Magistrate. Losk, 1574. John Karkan.

8. A Translation of Luther's Catechism into the Lithuano-Russian Dialect. Nieswicz, 1562. In this Translation Budnæus was assisted by Matthias Kawieczynski and Laurence Criscovius.

9. On the Justification of Sinful Man before God. This was written in the Lithuano-Russian dialect, and with the same assistance. Nieswicz, 1562.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 54, 55. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 80—85. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Ch. xiv. pp. 362—364. *Moshemii* Inst. II. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § xxii. p. 723. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vita A. Wissowatii, p. 226, etc.

77.

STANISLAÛS BUDZINIUS, (*Polon.* BUDZYŃSKI,) was amatuënsis to John a Lasco and Francis Lismaninus, and afterwards assistant to Jerome Philipovius, Vice-palatine of Cracow. He contended, with Simon Budnæus and Francis Davidis, that prayer to Christ was not sanctioned by Scripture. For his opinion on this subject he was excommunicated; but in the year 1588, after an exclusion of twelve years from the communion of his Church, he was reconciled to the Brethren.

It was the fate of all Budzinius's writings to remain in manuscript, although a copious use has been made by Sandius, Lubieniecicus, Wengerseus and others, of his "Ecclesiastical History of Poland and the neighbouring Countries, from the Beginning of the Reformation to the Year 1593." This work was written in the Polish language. Erasmus Otvinovius testifies, that a part of it perished in the hands of a certain unbeliever, whom however he does not name. Of the principal facts recorded in it Budzinius himself was an eye-witness.

Besides the above History, Budzinius wrote

1. A Letter to the Synod of Racow, in 1574; in which

he exhorted the Brethren to concord, and defended the use of arms, and the magisterial office. *Polon.*

2. A Letter to Gregory Pauli, in which he also defended the opinion, that it is lawful for a Christian man to act as a Magistrate, and to bear arms: and

3. A Treatise on the Millennium, composed about the year 1589 or 1590, of which Faustus Socinus wrote a refutation. *Polon.*

Bock thinks, too, that Budzinius was the author of a work, preserved in the Zaluscian Library at Warsaw, and containing the lives of sixty-two Archbishops of Gnezno. The author is called *Stanislaus Buzenski*; and the argument of the work is given in the “Bibliotheca Warsaviensis,” P. iii. and iv.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 55. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 85, 86, etc.

78.

FRANCIS DAVIDIS, known among the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf by the name of *Desiderius Erasmus*, was not a Hungarian, as Sandius and many other writers have said, but a Transylvanian, of the Saxon race. The Rev. Theophilus Lindsey justly characterizes him as “a most learned man, of admirable sense, and of a life irreproachable.” (Hist. View, Ch. iii. Sect. i. p. 154.) Before he contemplated studying for the Christian ministry, he had made the requisite proficiency in languages, and general literature; and while yet a youth, his progress was such as not unfrequently to surpass the demands and expectations of his instructors. When, at length, he devoted himself to the study of Divinity, his acquirements were so various, that he soon became a skilful theological disputant; and his command of language was so great, that those who heard him were struck with wonder and admiration at the

powers of eloquence which he displayed. He was appointed tutor to John Sigismund II., son of John de Zapolya, and grandson of Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland; and acquired great influence over his pupil, who, besides following him as a guide in other matters, adopted, and became interested in the diffusion of his religious opinions.

At first Davidis supported the views of the Evangelical Lutherans; and for some time was a warm opponent of those, who adopted the Helvetic Confession. He afterwards inclined to the party of the Reformed Church: then he was led, by his inquiries, into a kind of Syncretism: and, at length, he was converted to the Unitarian faith by George Blandrata.

While he was Rector of the School at Coloswar, or Clausenburg, he successfully opposed Stancarus, who was charged with exciting disturbances among the Reformed Churches of Transylvania. By some tracts, which Davidis published against this restless man, he so weakened his influence, that, after the death of his patrons, Petrovizi and Anthony Kendi, he lost all his supporters; and, finding no place of refuge in Transylvania, he retired into Poland. The question in dispute was, In what sense Christ is our Mediator; whether both in his divine and human nature, or in his human nature only? Davidis, with the members of the Synod of Clausenburg generally, contended for the former; and Stancarus for the latter.

The above controversy took place in the years 1557 and 1558. But it was not the only one, in which Davidis distinguished himself; for, after his conversion to Unitarianism, he displayed as much zeal and erudition, in opposition to the Trinitarians, as he had previously shewn in his contest with Stancarus. He became the intimate friend of Blandrata, by whose recommendation to John Sigismund II., he was appointed Preacher to the Court at Clausenburg.

in which office he displaced Dionysius Alesius, the Lutheran Minister. He was also constituted Superintendent of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania, and was the first person who held that office.

Davidis and Blandrata, by their joint labours, succeeded so far as to engage the Prince, and the greater part of the Nobility in their cause, and brought over almost the whole province to their sentiments; obtaining, for the Ministers and members of their communion, the privilege of professing and preaching their doctrines, without let or hindrance.

On the 15th of March, 1566, at a Synod, assembled at Thorda, in Transylvania, some Ministers of the Hungarian Churches, with Blandrata and Davidis at their head, published a Confession of Faith, in which they impugned the doctrine of the Trinity. This caused an animated discussion, and led to a separation between the two parties. Of the particulars of this important controversy Lampe has given a minute account, in his "*Historia Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria et Transylvania.*" From the year 1566 to 1578, Blandrata and Davidis appear to have acted together with perfect cordiality; but in the latter year a disagreement took place between them, concerning the Invocation of Christ, Blandrata affirming, and Davidis denying, that Christ is a proper object of worship. For the purpose of bringing this unhappy dispute to a close, Faustus Socinus was invited to undertake a journey from Basle, where he was then living, to Clausenburg; and his expenses were defrayed by Blandrata. Socinus was a guest in the house of Davidis, from November, 1578, to April, 1579; during which time the subject underwent a full discussion. By agreement, the arguments were committed to writing from time to time; and the papers were regularly transmitted by Socinus to Blandrata. But the result was, that Davidis, instead of being convinced by the reasoning of Socinus,

was more confirmed in his own opinion, that Christ is not a proper object of religious worship. The following Propositions, said to contain the opinion of Francis Davidis concerning the character of Christ, together with the Counter-Propositions of Blandrata, were sent to the members of the Diet, with a Convocatory Epistle, written by the latter, and dated Clausenburg, April 7th, 1579. They were printed by Lampe, in his “History of the Reformed Church of Hungary and Transylvania,” (pp. 306—311,) from a manuscript copy, communicated to him by Helmeicz. In the Works of Faustus Socinus, (T. II. pp. 801—803,) they are given, with the exception of the first, as “Theses [or Propositions] by which the Opinion of Francis Davidis concerning the Office of Christ is explained, together with Antitheses, [or Counter-Propositions] of the Church, written by Faustus Socinus, and presented to the Most Illustrious Prince of Transylvania, Christopher Bathory.” Why the first was omitted does not appear; nor is it likely that the Propositions ascribed to Davidis were actually penned by him. Some allowance, therefore, must be made for the offensive form, which they occasionally assume; but still, perhaps, they may be regarded as substantially expressing the opinions of Davidis, and others of the same school, respecting the person and offices of Christ, and may enable us to understand, how the charge, brought against Budnæus, of denying the Christian faith, and embracing Judaism, arose.

THESES OF FRANCIS
DAVIDIS.

1. The man, Jesus of Nazareth, son of Mary, the wife of Joseph, was conceived and born of the seed of

ANTITHESES OF GEORGE
BLANDRATA.

1. The man, Jesus of Nazareth, was conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, the Holy

Joseph, in whatever way that may have happened. We believe that he is the Messiah, promised by God in the Old Testament.

2. The man, Jesus of Nazareth, who is called *Christ*, spake not by the prophetic spirit, but only by the Holy Spirit; and although he was an ambassador from God, yet the words which he spake, in the course of his teaching, are not to be considered as proceeding from the mouth of God himself.

3. Hence it is, that his words, and those of his Apostles, are to be tried only by the test of the Mosaic Law, and the other prophetic oracles; and if anything is found, or seems to be found, either contrary to these, or different from them, it must either be rejected, or so interpreted, that it may

Spirit causing that conception, without the intervention of man; and although he was in no way whatever conceived, or born of the seed of Joseph, the husband of Mary, we are nevertheless bound to believe, that he is the Messiah, promised by God in the Old Testament.

2. The man, Jesus of Nazareth, who is called *Christ*, spake not only by the prophetic spirit, but by a spirit more than prophetic, since he was the express image of God, and in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; so that, in teaching, he said not a single word, which may not be considered as uttered by God himself, with his own mouth.

3. Hence it is, that his words, and those of his Apostles, ought to have such authority, that whatever is opposed to them, or seems to be opposed, in the writings of Moses, or the Prophets, must either be altogether rejected, or interpreted by them, as not only explaining the sayings of

manifestly agree with the doctrine of Moses and the Prophets, which alone ought to be to us the rule of manners and life, and of divine worship.

4. For we must not suppose, that there is any difference whatever, either in doctrine, (especially so far as relates to manners,) or in the divine promises, between the Old Covenant established by Moses, and the New by Jesus Christ: but in this respect only can they be said to differ, that in the Old Covenant there was the ministry of the letter, but in the New there is that of the spirit: so that in no respect ought it to be said, that the former has become obsolete, or in any way old, but confirmed.

5. Especially since the New Covenant existed only for a short season, that is, till the destruction of Jerusalem; and after that, neither had, nor will have place but in part, till Jesus shall

Moses and the Prophets, where it is necessary, but also as partly abrogating, and partly fulfilling them, and as being the source, whence the whole rule of life and manners must be drawn.

4. For as great a distinction must be made between the Old Covenant established by Moses, and the New by Jesus Christ, as between the shadow of the body and the body itself; and both in doctrines, (even such as relates to manners,) and in the divine promises, a remarkable difference must be acknowledged: so that the Old being superseded, except as far as it agrees with the New, we should acquiesce in the New, since the former has not only been changed, but has become completely obsolete.

5. Especially since the New Covenant is eternal, and must endure to the end of the world; nor ever has ceased in any respect, or ever will cease, till the Lord Jesus shall again descend from hea-

come again, and in this world, in the city of Jerusalem itself restored, reign over the carnal people of Jacob, as the other kings of the earth do, but with perfect justice and holiness.

6. In the mean time, Jesus is indeed the Christ, or King of God's people, but by destination only; since it is certain, from the oracles of all the Prophets, that the Christ promised by God was to have no other kingdom than an earthly one, and such as has been mentioned above.

7. Jesus was sent by God into the world, that he might at once take possession of a kingdom of this kind: but because the Jews, to whom he had been promised, and whose king he ought to be, would not receive him, after he had been slain by them, contrary to the purpose of God, God took him away from them, and translated him to a place, where he

ven, and come to judge the quick and the dead, and shall bestow upon those, who have received and kept this covenant, the reward of a heavenly and eternal life, but inflict the punishment of eternal death upon those, who either have rejected it, or, after receiving, have not kept it.

6. In the mean time, Jesus is truly the Christ, or King of God's people; for the kingdom of Christ promised by God is not an earthly, but was to be a heavenly one, as Jesus himself and his Disciples have shewn, by their explanation of the divine oracles.

7. But that Jesus might indeed obtain a kingdom of this kind, it was necessary, (God so commanding and decreeing,) that he should undergo the death of the cross, to be inflicted on him, according to God's purpose, by the Jews, to whom he had been sent; after which, being raised by God from the dead, he was exalted to the true heaven on high,

rests safely in the protection of God ; for it is in this way that he sits on the right hand of God in the heavens.

8. Thus he waits there, till all his enemies shall be subdued unto him, that so he may have his promised kingdom ; and, in the mean time, remains in a quiescent state.

9. He is not therefore any longer to be called *God*, as perhaps when he was conversant in this world he might be, by reason of his office ; for that office, as we have said, has ceased.

10. On which account those persons shamefully err, who adore him now absent, which cannot be done without rendering him divine homage ; since, not even when he was personally pre-

where he sits on the right hand of God, that is, obtains a power next to the Supreme God himself, over the Universal Church both in heaven and earth.

8. Therefore, having thus obtained the kingdom promised to him, he governs the whole Church ; and, at the same time, the aforesaid power of God being communicated to him, and God himself moreover authorizing it, he has leisure to subject his enemies to himself, till at length he shall have conquered all but one [viz. death].

9. He may now, therefore, with the utmost propriety be called *God*, since, by the appointment of God, he fills an office of the highest dignity, and is invested with the highest divine power both in heaven and on earth.

10. On which account, though now absent, religious adoration is to be paid to him ; since, before he received his kingdom, and while he was yet on earth, he was deservedly worshiped

sent, could he be worshiped, otherwise than by a kind of civil and human homage, without the greatest offence against God.

11. Wherefore, we also neither can, nor ought to serve him, or pay him reverence, in any other way than by obeying him, and keeping his precepts:—

12. Nor to confide in him, except so far as to believe that what he has said to us is true; and to entertain a confident expectation, that we shall receive what he has promised us in the name of God.

13. But to invoke him, and implore his aid and assistance in our necessities, is just as though any one should implore Mary, and other dead saints, who have never given us the least evidence of their ability either to hear our prayers, or to grant our requests.

14. But neither can we call upon him, any more than upon the aforesaid dead saints, to pray to God for us, or to obtain anything for

with more than human and civil homage. Those who omit to do this, most shamefully offend against God himself.

11. Wherefore, we also are bound both to serve and worship him, as constituted our Lord and God, by the Supreme God, and as most fully reigning over us:—

12. And also to place our hope and trust in him, as in one, who, with God's approbation, actually sets before us our chief good.

13. But to invoke him, and implore his aid in our necessities, is just as though any one should implore God himself, since it is certain that he, in the name of God, can hear our prayers, and grant all things which are needful for us.

14. We may also call upon him, to pray to God for us, or to obtain anything for us from God; yet so that, by these modes of expression,

us from God; for he no longer discharges the office of Mediator between God and us. As to what is written, that he still intercedes for us, it only means, that the prayers which he offered up to God while he was here, in behalf of all who should have faith in him, are even now efficacious in the sight of God himself.

15. His priesthood moreover, if he ever was a Priest, came to an end, when he expired upon the cross; and his sacrifice neither does nor can profit us, in any other way than, on account of the efficacy of that sacrifice, though already past, which endures for ever: wherefore, his priesthood is said to be an everlasting one, and he is said to be a Priest for ever;

we acknowledge before God, that all the power of assisting us possessed by him he derived, not from himself, but from God; since in this sense the Scripture says, that Christ now intercedes for us before God. For he is now, in heaven, a Mediator between God and us, in a much more excellent sense than he was on earth. On earth he announced to us the goodness of God, and truly prayed for us; but in heaven he himself carries into effect for us the goodness of God, and all the blessings which are derived from God to his Church, are given through him.

15. His priesthood moreover is eternal, and he was truly invested with it, when, after the death of the cross, he entered into the holy of holies, and appeared in the presence of God for us; where the sacrifice which he made of himself to God, not only by its efficacy, as a thing that is past, but chiefly in virtue of him as the offerer, is profitable to us, so far

and perhaps it is somewhere written, that he still expiates our sins.

as, by this offering, he has obtained supreme power; because it is most clearly affirmed in Scripture, that he always expiates our sins, and continually and unceasingly delivers us from the punishment of our sins.

16. Therefore, Jesus Christ having left this world, to pass a life of undisturbed repose, we should believe or look to it, that we are not now assisted by him, or his influence with God, any further than as, while he was among us, he shewed us the way of salvation, and taught us how to draw nigh to God, till, when about to receive a kingdom, he shall return to us, and become truly the Christ of God; and being personally present in this world, shall nourish and sustain us by the power of God. In the mean time, let us always flee to God alone, not trusting in the power of Christ, or in his presence and help.

16. Therefore, seeing that we have such a High-Priest in heaven, set over the household of God, who, living for ever, can save to the uttermost those who come to God by him; trusting in his power and presence, let us not cease to offer up our prayers to our God and Father through him, till, coming from heaven, he shall transform our vile bodies, and render them like unto his own glorious body, by that power, by which he, who is now truly the Christ, can subdue all things to himself.

“This paper,” says Dr. Toulmin, (Mem. of F. Socinus, p. 463,) “shews the great difference between Socinus [for it was no doubt drawn up by him] and Francis David in

the sentiments they entertained concerning the character of Christ, and the Christian doctrine. Most persons will be disposed to consider those of Francis David as derogatory to the glory and excellency of the Gospel, and as bearing a greater resemblance to Judaism than to Christianity. Hence he and his disciples were called Semi-Judaizers. Mosheim seems to consider this name merely as an ignominious appellation, bestowed upon them by the Socinians from a spirit of rancour, and with a view to render them odious: but I apprehend the reader will be ready to conclude, from the above Theses, that it was really grounded on their sentiments, and expressive of the partial preference they gave to the law of Moses above the gospel of Christ. It is certain that the Invocation of Christ was not the only point of difference between them and the Socinians; but all the ideas of these two sects concerning the present dignity of Christ, and the perfection of his religion, were totally opposite to each other. It looks as if the former had recourse to peculiar notions on those heads, in order to evade the force of Socinus's arguments for the worship of him, from the high trust, and vast power and dominion with which he was invested by God. The modern Unitarians, who have denied the worship of Christ, have been far from running into notions of his office so derogatory to his dignity, which evidently deprive his disciples of the consolation flowing from the contemplation of his character, and tending to enervate the weight and authority of his precepts. Though, with Socinus, they believe that our Lord does now actually sustain the office of High-Priest for us in heaven, ministering to God, and acting for us, and that he filleth a station of great power and dignity; yet they do not see the force of these conclusions, which he drew from these sentiments, to vindicate the worship of Christ."

Blandrata, with Socinus, and the rest of their party, fearing lest they should be charged with holding the same opinions as Davidis, referred the whole dispute to the Prince of Transylvania, who ordered Davidis to be cast into prison. “It would have been happy,” says Mr. Lindsey, (Hist. View, Chap. iii. pp. 159—164,) “if Blandrata had suffered things to have gone on in their own train; and left the Ministers to settle the point in question among themselves, and with their respective congregations, without interfering himself any farther, or calling in the secular power, as was afterwards done. In which case it may well be conjectured, that the sentiment of Davides would have prevailed, and the worship of Christ, or of any other person, but the God and Father of all, would have been intirely excluded from their Churches. For, after all, Socinus himself tells us, that he neither satisfied Blandrata, nor the Unitarians of Transylvania, nor his Polish Brethren, that he stood upon solid ground in this controversy; because he confessed, that *there was no express command in the Scriptures for the Invocation of Christ*: so that they would never consent to his printing his own account of it; and he adds, that at the last it came out by the encouragement, and at the expense of a particular friend. And moreover, while the dispute was depending, or soon after, in a private assembly of some of the Ministers of Transylvania, there had been a general agreement in disapproving the custom of praying to Christ; and they had come to some resolutions against it, ‘*Christi invocationi plane adversantia*,’ says Socinus.—It was laid to Davides’s charge, that he had violated his word, by taking a principal part in the resolutions of this assembly. As this accusation was brought against him after he was dead, and could not defend himself, we cannot determine how far, or whether he was at all blameable; only we find his friends vindicated him in it

intirely. As to that which Socinus farther urges against him, viz. that after having been cautioned not to propagate his impious doctrine, (as he calls it, but surely in too dogmatical and imperious a way,) Davides, on the contrary notwithstanding, upon the very next day, being Sunday, preaching in the great Church to the people, told them in so many words, that *there was as much foundation for praying to the Virgin Mary and other dead saints, as to Jesus Christ*: there seems to have been nothing reprehensible in this. Who had any just authority to restrain or limit him, in the instructions which he was to deliver from the Scriptures to the congregation? It might have been his duty, and so esteemed by him, to bear his testimony in this public way, to so important a doctrine, as that which related to the true and only object of divine worship. At the last, however, when Davides could not be prevailed upon to try to procure a repeal of those resolutions, made by himself and other Ministers, which condemned the worship of Christ, nor would promise to conceal or suppress his sentiments (which was much to his honour, as it was very assuming in Socinus and Blandrata to put him upon it); the civil power interposed, most probably at the instigation of the latter, and three days after Davides had preached the above discourse, the Senate of Clausenburg had orders from the Prince, to remove him from his office of public Teacher, and put him in prison."

The proceedings against him were of a very summary nature. A Synod was convened; and to this assembly, consisting of Nobles and Pastors, it was left to acquit, or condemn Davidis, or prevail upon him to recant. On being introduced into the presence of his Judges, he was asked, whether he was the author of the Propositions attributed to him, which not only common report said were his, but which were also ascribed to him by those, who had for-

merly been his most intimate friends; and he replied, that he taught the same things as others, who now threw the whole blame upon him. His son-in-law, Lucas, Notary Public of Clausenburg, and Dragetta Sandor, whose religious opinions coincided with his own, and who also shared his imprisonment, asserted the same thing. But he was pronounced guilty, and three days afterwards sent to Deva, where, in three days more, according to Häner, as quoted by Lampe, (p. 304,) he died in a state of frenzy, June 6th, 1579.

Other accounts say, that the death of Davidis did not take place, till the 15th of November; and represent the quarrel between him and Blandrata as having originated, not in any actual difference of religious opinion, but in a spirit of revenge, which is said to be the besetting sin of Italians, (“*Italorum maximum vitium*,”) and has therefore been emphatically designated, “*Peccatum Italicum*.” Disgusted with his duplicity, it is said, that Davidis declined all further intercourse with Blandrata, and took measures to destroy his influence in the Unitarian body, which naturally drew upon him the resentment of the wily Physician, and paved the way for those proceedings, which terminated in his own death.

It has been thought, indeed, that it was Davidis’s honesty, and not his heresy, which rendered him an object, first of dislike, and then of persecution; and that Blandrata, finding him unwilling to cloke his convictions on a subject, which appeared likely to impede the progress of Unitarian views, by deterring the orthodox from embracing them, or even approaching them in a spirit of candid inquiry, resolved upon silencing him, by the strong hand of the civil power. Mosheim, who tells us, that “the little sect” to which Davidis belonged “is branded, by the Socinian writers, with the ignominious appellation of *Semi-*

Judaizers," subjoins, by way of note, the following remarks, which may be thought by some to afford a key to the conduct of the Socinian party, not only on this, but on some other occasions, at a later period of their history. "Faustus Socinus wrote a particular treatise against the Semi-Judaizers, which is published in the second volume of his Works, p. 804. It is, however, worthy of observation, that the motive, which engaged Socinus and his friends to employ so much pains and labour in the suppression of this faction, was not a persuasion of the pernicious tendency of its doctrines, or peculiar notions. On the contrary, Socinus himself expressly acknowledges that this controversy turns upon matters of very little importance, by declaring it as his opinion, that praying, or offering up divine worship to Christ, is not necessary to salvation. * * * We find also Lubieniecus, in his *Histor. Reformat. Polonicae*, lib. iii. cap. xi. p. 228, speaking lightly enough of this controversy, and representing it as a matter of very little moment; whence he says, that in Transylvania, *there was a storm in a tea-cup*. From all this, then, it appears manifest, that Socinus and his followers were more artful than ingenuous in their proceedings with respect to Davidis. They persecuted him and his followers, lest, by tolerating his doctrine, they should increase the odium under which they already lay, and draw upon themselves anew the resentment of other Christian Churches, while, in their private judgment, they looked upon this very doctrine and its professors as worthy of toleration and indulgence." (Instit. II. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § xxiii. Not. m. p. 723.) What part Faustus Socinus took, or did not take, in the proceedings against Francis Davidis, will afford matter for future consideration. In the mean time, it may be remarked, that if he did not regard "praying, or offering up divine worship to Christ" as "necessary to salvation,"

he may still have considered the difference between his own views and those of Davidis, on this and other kindred subjects, as neither few nor unimportant. Besides, when Lubieniecius expresses himself as he does, respecting the controversy in Transylvania, it may be presumed, that he does not mean to characterize it as useless, or trifling in itself, but that he looks upon it as having acquired an undue degree of importance, by the manner in which it was prosecuted, and the consequences to which it led.

In the year 1569, Davidis and Blandrata published jointly, "A Refutation of a Writing of George Major, in which he has endeavoured to prove, that God is three in Person, and one in Essence." This work is supposed, by Sandius, to have been printed at Weissenburg; but though the name of Davidis stands first in the title-page, Blandrata seems to have been the principal author. In the year following, Davidis published, at the same place, "Letters to the Polish Churches, on the Question concerning Christ's Reign of a thousand Years upon Earth." Another work, in Latin verse, has been attributed to him, bearing the inscription, "Dehortatio et Descriptio Dei tripersonati." It has no proper title, or title-page; and some of the allusions to the doctrine of the Trinity contained in it, are such as do no credit, either to the candour, or taste of the author, whoever he may have been. Sandius makes no allusion to this poem, in his account of Davidis; but Boeck was led, by what he deemed conclusive internal evidence, to attribute it to him. The other writings of Davidis consist chiefly of tracts, in controversy with Faustus Socinus and Blandrata; and are as follow.

1. Four Propositions, addressed to F. Socinus, on the Non-invocation of Christ in Prayer. To these F. Socinus opposed his "Responsio ad Theses IV. Franc. Davidis."

2. A Confutation of the Answer of Faustus. In this

“Confutation” Davidis hazards the supposition, that the word *Ἰησοῦ*, Acts vii. 59, is not in the vocative, but the genitive case, as though Stephen had intended to invoke, not Jesus himself, but the Father of Jesus. This mode of interpretation has recently been advocated by Mr. Herman Heinfetter in a small tract, entitled, “*Ἰησοῦς, Κύριος*, their Usage and Sense in Holy Scripture. London, 1847, Cra-dock and Co.” 12mo. (Vide *Christian Reformer*, N. S. Vol. IV. Sept. 1848, pp. 557. 691.)

3. A Defence of Francis Davidis, intended to shew that Jesus Christ ought not to be invoked in Prayer. This seems to have been the joint production of James Palæologus, Matthias Glirius, and Francis Davidis; and was published in 8vo., 1580, and at Basle, 1581.

4. Some Questions, and Faustus Socinus’s Answer to them. These Questions are inserted in the collected Works of Faustus Socinus.

5. A Treatise, in three Chapters, on the Duality; to which is annexed a second Treatise, intended to prove that the One God of Israel alone, the Father of Jesus Christ, and no other, is to be invoked, and containing the Sixteen Theses proposed in the General Synod at Thorda, April 26th, 1579. A third Treatise also is added, containing Observations on the Nine Theses of George Blandrata.

6. Three Propositions, to which Blandrata opposed Thirty. (Vide *Art.* 38, No. 7.)

7. A Reply to Blandrata’s Thirty Propositions, in which it is asserted, that Jesus Christ cannot now be called *God*; that Jesus cannot be invoked in Prayer; and that Justification and Predestination have not been properly understood by Luther and Calvin: together with some Remarks on the Kingdom of that Messiah, whom the Prophets foretold, and who was Jesus Christ. 1578. To the preceding may be added,

8. A Confession concerning the Trinity; presented to the Synod of Waradein, in 1569, with Nine Articles. In this Confession Jesus Christ is recognized as an object of adoration and worship (Lampe, Hist. Eccles. Ref. in Hung. et Transylv. L. ii. Anno 1569, p. 227): but it should be recollected, that it was drawn up ten years before the death of Francis Davidis.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 55—57. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 238—243. *Fred. Adolph. Lampe*, Hist. Eccles. Reform. in Hungaria et Transylvania, Trajecti ad Rhen. 1728, 4to. pp. 116—311. *F. Socini* Opera, T. II. pp. 801—803. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Ch. ii. Sect. iii.; Ch. iv. p. 325; Append. iii. *Lubienieci's* Hist. Ref. Polon. l. c. *Moshem.* Inst. H. E. l. c. *Cloppenb.* Opera Theol. T. II. pp. 329, 330. *Zeltner's* Hist. Crypto-Socin. C. ii. § xiii. pp. 200—203. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Chap. iii. Sect. i. *Rees's* Hist. Introd. to the Racovian Catechism, pp. xli—lxii.

79.

JOHN SOMMER, of Pirna, a fortified town of Upper Saxony, is represented by Bock as a man holding peculiar opinions; and as never having been approved of, in all respects, either by the followers of Socinus, or Socinus himself. He is said to have followed a military life till the year 1555; then to have prosecuted his studies some time at the University of Wittenberg; and afterwards to have gone into Hungary and Transylvania, in the latter of which countries he is supposed to have become a Unitarian. He was appointed Master of the School at Bistritz, in Transylvania; and after remaining there some time, went back into Germany. But he was invited to return to Transylvania, by Blandrata and Davidis, and undertake the management of the School at Clausenburg.

Adam Neuser, who had been obliged to leave Germany in the year 1571, and had travelled through Holland and France, met him in Poland, in the spring of the year following, and accompanied him into Transylvania. Lu-

bieniecius mentions, that Sommer and Neuser arrived at Cracow on the same day, but whether by accident, or by appointment, does not appear; and that they set out, on the 15th of April, on their way into Transylvania. What happened to Neuser, after their arrival there, will be found in the account of that singularly unfortunate man. (*Vide Art.* 85.) Sommer continued, for a year or two, at Clausenburg; but was taken off by the plague, about the year 1573, or 1574, together with his wife and daughter-in-law.

He was a remarkably good Greek scholar, and attained to considerable eminence as a poet. It is not known what led him to abandon the doctrine of the Trinity. Zeltner thought, that his defection from the ranks of Lutheranism took place while he was at Wittenberg; and that Lælius Socinus was instrumental in his conversion. But Lælius was at Wittenberg only from July, 1550, to June, 1551; and Sommer did not go thither till after the close of Charles the Fifth's last expedition into the Netherlands, in 1555. Besides, as Bock observes, it cannot be proved, that he imbibed Unitarian opinions in Germany. Nor is Bock's own conjecture more probable, that these opinions were instilled into him by Neuser; because the letter, accompanying Sommer's "Eight Theses concerning the Papal Trinity," is dated May 15th, 1571, nearly a year before he and Neuser met at Cracow. It should be recollected also, that Sommer at this time held the office of Rector of the School at Clausenburg; that he had been invited to fill that office by Blandrata and Davidis, who had impugned the doctrine of the Trinity at Thorda, as early as March, 1566; and that they had probably had frequent opportunities of intercourse with him, during his former residence in Transylvania. It seems, therefore, on the whole, most probable, that he was the convert of Blandrata, or Davidis.

Ruarus says, that James Palæologus, Francis Davidis, and John Sommer, in their later writings, and also Christian Francken, followed in the footsteps of Glirius; from which it would seem, that Glirius was regarded as the founder of that school of Theology, which refused to join in the Invocation of Christ.

After the death of Sommer, Palæologus and Glirius were appointed Co-rectors of the School at Clausenburg. At that time, therefore, as is evident, many of the leading Unitarians of Transylvania were of the same opinion with Budnæus and Davidis respecting the worship of Christ. Sommer was the intimate friend of Davidis, and was known, among the Crypto-Socinians at Altorf, by the name of *Therinus*, which is a Græcized form of his own German name *Sommer*, corresponding with our English word *Summer*. (Vide *Art.* 168.)

The following writings have been attributed to him.

1. An Elegiac Poem on the Kings of Hungary.
2. Eight Theses on the Papal Trinity, 1571; inserted, with an Epistle of Sommer's, dated May 15th, 1571, in Lubieniecicus's "History of the Polish Reformation."
3. A Refutation of Peter Carolius's "Explanation of the Orthodox Faith concerning the One true God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, against the Errors of George Blandrata and Francis Davidis. 1571." To this "Refutation" were added tracts on various subjects; and prefixed to the whole was an Epistle of Theodosius Schimberg, who published this "Refutation" in 1582.
4. A Confutation of the Objections mentioned at the Close of Theodosius Schimberg's Epistle, prefixed to No. 3.
5. On Man's Justification in the Sight of God. Also Propositions on the same Subject, addressed to the Elders at Thorda, Sept. 19th, 1572; together with the Answer

of the Elders at Clausenburg, Sept. 29th, 1572, and a Confutation of "the Answer of the Elders," Oct. 5th, by John Sommer.

6. A brief Declamation against the Predestination of the Neoterics.

7. A Declamation against Adult Baptism.

8. Theological Paradoxes.

9. A Life of James, the Despot, Ruler of Moldavia, with brief Commentaries of Peter Albinus on Wallachia. Wittenb. 1587, 4to. This work is very small, but very rare. James, the Despot, to whom it relates, was called Heraclides, and obtained celebrity, under that name, among the Princes of Moldavia.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 57, 58. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 888—894. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xi. pp. 234—238. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, pp. 349—354; Supplem. p. 1232. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 46.

80.

JAMES PALÆOLOGUS was a native of the isle of Chios, and one of the earliest among the Antitrinitarian Reformers, who taught that Christ was not entitled to the honours of divine worship. Zeltner, who is generally very successful in investigating the history of Crypto-Socinianism, has confounded Palæologus with James Suter, (*vide Art.* 86,) the companion of the unfortunate Vehe (*vide Art.* 81). Dudithius has entered, at considerable length, into his history; and calls him sometimes *the Chian*, and sometimes *Palæologus*, in the Letters which he addresses to him, and which are preserved in the Elizabethan Library, at Breslau. Stieff, in his Life of Dudithius, has given occasional extracts from these Letters, which leave a feeling of regret in the reader's mind, that he did not give more.

Palæologus is said to have sprung from the Imperial family of Constantinople. He was one of the many Chris-

tians, who took refuge in Italy, after the Turks had become masters of that city; and during his residence in Italy, was immured in the prisons of the Inquisition, from which he escaped in the year 1559, and fled into Germany. After this he resided successively in Poland and Transylvania, where he zealously propagated his sentiments, and supported them by his publications.

He undertook, with Matthias Glirius, the joint Rectorship of the School at Clausenburg, about the year 1573 or 1574; and his opinion respecting the Invocation of Christ coincided with that of Francis Davidis and John Sommer. In other words, he taught, that prayer was not to be offered up to Christ in any way, or under any pretext whatever. On this account, Socinus calls him "a Jew," and "a man quite blinded with hatred of Christ's glory." He says, that "nothing can be devised more profligate, or more debasing to the Christian religion," than this opinion of Palæologus. He even goes so far as to contend, that, if this opinion be true, "Christ and his Apostles can only be regarded as notorious impostors and falsifiers, and no credit can, or ought to be given to their sayings." Mr. Lindsey, in his "Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship from the Reformation to our own Times," enters at considerable length into the subject of Socinus's attack upon Palæologus; and shews, that the arguments which he uses, and by which he attempts to justify the Invocation of Christ, would be equally valid, for the purpose of justifying the Invocation of the Virgin Mary. Socinus contends, for example, that Christians would want the necessary aid and support, to keep them steady and virtuous in this dangerous world of trial, if they had not one, who had been a man like themselves, to apply to in prayer for help and assistance. "But this remark and assertion," says Mr. Lindsey, (pp. 209, 210,) "was

obviously nothing but the effect of custom and pure prejudice, in Socinus. Believing himself to have derived the greatest advantages from the use of prayer to Christ, in carrying him safe and innocent through various difficulties in the course of his life, he grew thence, by degrees, to imagine that it was a thing no less necessary for all Christians. So, many pious Roman Catholics have believed themselves to have reaped great spiritual benefit from praying to the Virgin Mary, and have been persuaded that those who neglected it, deprived themselves of a principal means to make them holy and virtuous. But none are to be governed by the fancies and authority of others, but by what the Scriptures prescribe, concerning the Object of Prayer. And these uniformly direct and lead us to make our supplications to the merciful Creator and heavenly Father, as one that careth for us, and who alone heareth, and can help us."

There were other questions, on which Palæologus differed widely from the Socinians; for he contended, that Christ did not abrogate the office of the Civil Magistrate, that war was allowable, and that Christians were themselves permitted to bear arms. On these points he was wholly at variance with the members of the Socinian body, whose opinions he combated, and whose favour he took no pains to conciliate.

For many years, the officers of the Inquisition, seconded by the powerful influence of the Pope, exerted their most strenuous efforts to get Palæologus again into their power, in which they at length succeeded. It is asserted by many writers, that he was imprisoned by order of the Emperor Maximilian II.; but as that Emperor died in the year 1576, and Palæologus's second imprisonment did not commence before the year 1581 or 1582, it is clear, that it must have taken place during the reign of the Emperor

Rudolph. Dudithius, in a letter addressed to Hagecius, Breslau, January 8th, 1582, alludes to his apprehension, by the Emperor's command, as an event of recent occurrence, and says, that he can imagine no other cause for it, than his religious opinions. "I grieve," he adds, "for the misfortune of the man, who is old, poor, and a foreigner, with a wife and family." In another letter, written on the 29th of the same month, and addressed to the same correspondent, he says, "I fear he will be sent to Rome." In a letter, addressed to Peter Monavius, and written March 15th, 1582, he alludes to a rumour, that the unfortunate Palæologus is to be delivered up to the Pope, and that the cause of this is his Antitrinitarianism; and in a subsequent letter to John Crato, dated July 30th, in the same year, he says, "they write from Bavaria, where the Emperor now is, that, by the imperial orders, and in compliance with the demand of the Pope, and the petition of his Legate, Palæologus has been sent to Rome, as an introducer of new heresies." In the same letter he says, "it is to be lamented, that the Cæsars are so obedient to the will of the Pontiffs, as to deliver over to punishment, at their request, those to whom both the Emperor himself, and his father, and his grandfather if I mistake not, granted an annual allowance."

Palæologus was detained a prisoner at Rome for nearly three years, and brought to trial. Some say, that he was remanded to prison, and died there. But it is generally admitted, that he was condemned to be burnt, as Dudithius had predicted in the year 1582; for, in a letter addressed to Hagecius, on the 10th of August in that year, he writes thus. "Palæologus is said to have been taken to Rome, to be offered to Moloch. O, wretched fate!" When he was led to punishment, and saw two persons, accused of Magic, bound to the stake, and roasted before a slow fire,

he made a feigned recantation : but on being brought back to prison, and again confessing himself an Antitrinitarian, he was dragged to the pile, and burnt alive, on the 25th of March, according to Bock, but, according to Sandius, on the 22nd of March, 1585. He wrote

1. An Account of the Persecutions at Rome in the Time of Pope Paul IV.

2. A Book on Baptism. The object of this work was to shew, that the Baptism mentioned in the Gospels does not relate to us, who are sons of the covenant. It seems to have been opposed to a little work of Gregory Pauli on the subject of Baptism. (Vide *Art.* 46, No. 23.)

3. On the Civil Magistrate. Losk, 1573. John Karkan. Simon Budnæus took charge of the publication of this work. The Racovians published a reply to it, in the composition of which Gregory Pauli appears to have had the principal share. Palæologus vindicated himself in

4. A Defence of the true Opinion concerning the Civil Magistrate. Losk, 1580. To this "Defence," which was also edited by Budnæus, a reply was published by Socinus, in 1581, 4to., and reprinted, under another title, at Racow, in 1627, 8vo.

5. A Defence of Francis Davidis by James Palæologus, Matthias Glirius, and F. Davidis, the Son. Frankf., 1579; Cracow, 1580, 8vo.

6. A true and solid Confutation of the Judgment of the Polish Churches concerning the Cause of Francis Davidis. To this were annexed Three Letters of Blandrata to Palæologus. (Vide *Art.* 38, No. 10.)

7. Spodanus, in his "*Annal. Eccles.*," T. II. f. 573, states, that Palæologus likewise assisted the Unitarians in their translation of the Scriptures, by which he is supposed to mean, Budnæus's Version of the Old and New Testament into the Polish language.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 58—60. *Moreri* Dict. Hist. Art. JACQUES PALEOLOGUE. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 583—587; T. II. pp. 798—804. *Socini* Opera, T. I. Fol. 1—114. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, p. 170, Not. c. p. 1234. *Moshemii* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. Cap. iv. § xxiii. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 46. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. ii. Sect. iii. pp. 78—82; Chap. iii. Sect. ii. § iii. pp. 204—208. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Chap. iii. Sect. i. p. 155, Note d.; Sect. ii. pp. 195—210, etc.

81.

MATTHIAS GLIRIUS is designated “a Physician” by Sandius; and Socinus, in the Preface to his Disputation with Francis Davidis, mentions him as one of those, who, in Transylvania, had controverted the received doctrine of praying to Christ, before it was publicly opposed by Davidis himself. That he was a German seems highly probable; but of what part of Germany he was a native has never been ascertained. Zeltner thinks, that he is the same with MATTHIAS VEHE, who had formerly been a Deacon at Luter, or Kaiserslautern, in the Lower Palatinate, or Palatinate of the Rhine; and that, having been banished, with James Suter, towards the end of the year 1572, he assumed the name of *Glirius*, for the purpose of avoiding suspicion. Ruarus, writing to Calovius, says, that he was the person called *Dietrich Dorsch*, and *Nathanaël Eliana Matthania*. Under the latter name, he published at Cologne, in 1578, a German work, “On the Kingdom of Christ,” to a Latin version of which Sandius refers.

His views respecting the kingdom of Christ seem to have resembled those of the Millennarians. Ruarus says, that he manifestly judaized; and that James Palæologus, Francis Davidis, John Sommer and Christian Francken adopted his opinions.

In the year 1583, an 8vo. volume was published, bearing the title, “Tractatus aliquot Christianæ Religionis,” and purporting to have been printed at Ingolstadt. But it is

said to have been really printed in Poland, and the impression must have been a small one, for Smalcius, in replying to some Theses, in which Wolfgang Franzius refers to it, confesses that he has never seen the work. The authors of the treatises contained in this volume were Matthias Glirius, Adam Neuser and John Sommer. The Preface was written, as has been stated in a former part of the present work, by Theodosius Schimberg. (*Vide Art.* 79, No. 4.) It was some years after the apostasy of Neuser, and the death of Sommer, that these treatises were published. That Glirius survived Sommer is placed beyond all doubt. Sandius supposes him to be the same person whom Possevin calls *Matthias Polonus*; and who, as a skilful Hebraïst, was appointed joint Rector of the School at Clausenburg with James Palæologus, after the death of Sommer.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 57. 60. 86. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 402, 403. 762. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, p. 353, Not. b. p. 1234. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 46.

82.

JOHN GLIRIUS was author of a treatise "On the Old and New Testament." Sandius and Bock give no particulars of his life; but it may be inferred, from the position which his name occupies in Sandius's list, that he was a contemporary of Matthias Glirius, of whom, judging from the identity of the surname, he was probably the brother, or some near relative.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 60. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 403.

83.

HERMANN VAN FLEKWYK was a Dutch Baptist, whose name has become memorable, in consequence of a Dialogue, which he held with Cornelius Adrians, a Franciscan Friar,

of Dort, commonly called *Broer Cornelis*, a man of a violent and bitter spirit, who was vociferous and severe in his discourses from the pulpit, not only against the Protestants, but against the government, and his own party, if they did not please him. Through the instrumentality of this individual, Van Flekwyk was burnt at Bruges, in Flanders, June 10th, 1569.

The "Dialogue" above alluded to was originally written in Dutch, and inserted in the oldest Martyrology of the Mennonites; but has been expunged from the later editions. Brandt transferred it to his "*Historia Reformationis quæ in Belgio accidit*," L. x.; and the late Dr. Toulmin published an English translation of it, as a tract, under the title of "A Dialogue between a Dutch Protestant and a Franciscan Friar. London, 1784." Before the execution of Van Flekwyk, it was ascertained by the Inquisitor, in the course of this Dialogue, that he had imbibed Antitrinitarian sentiments. The following is the substance of the conversation, which took place between them.

The Friar told Van Flekwyk, that, if he turned Catholic, and ordered his children to be baptized, he would be only beheaded. The prisoner asked him, whether he would not be deemed a good Catholic, if he sincerely acknowledged that he had erred in the faith? The Inquisitor replied in the affirmative. Hermann then asked, "Could you shed the blood of a good Christian, without committing a great sin?" Brother Cornelius told him, in a furious tone, that, even in this case, he ought to suffer death, since he had been an apostate. "But," answered the prisoner, "the man, mentioned by Jesus Christ, who had a hundred sheep, did not cut the throat of the sheep which he had lost, as soon as he had recovered her. He put her upon his shoulders, and carried her home with great joy." The Dialogue then proceeded as follows.

“*Inquisitor.* You have blasphemed against the true body and blood of God, by speaking against the Mass.”

“*Prisoner.* I have not said one word about the body and blood of God; and therefore I am not guilty of the blasphemy you lay to my charge.”

“*Inq.* Are not the body and blood of Christ the body and blood of God? Are not God the Father, and God the Son, one God? Do you pretend to make two Gods of them? Are you also an Antitrinitarian?”

“*Pris.* Don’t you say, that you offer up every day to God, in the Mass, his Son Jesus Christ? When you speak thus, you distinguish God from the body of his Son; and yet you say now, that it is the flesh and body of God.”

“*Inq.* What! Don’t you believe, that Christ is the second person of the Holy Trinity?”

“*Pris.* We never call things, but as they are called in Scripture.”

“*Inq.* Does not the Scripture mention God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit?”

“*Pris.* The Scripture speaks of One God, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit.”

“*Inq.* If you had read the Creed of St. Athanasius, you would have found in it ‘God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.’”

“*Pris.* I am a stranger to the Creed of St. Athanasius. It is sufficient for me to believe in the living God, and that Christ is the Son of the living God, as Peter believed; and to believe in the Holy Spirit, which the Father hath poured out upon us through Jesus Christ our Lord, as Paul says.”

“*Inq.* You are an impertinent fellow, to fancy that God pours out his spirit upon you, who do not believe that the Holy Spirit is God! You have borrowed those heretical opinions from the diabolical books of the cursed Erasmus

of Rotterdam,* who, in his Preface to the Works of St. Hilary, pretends that this holy man says, at the end of his twelfth Book, that the Holy Spirit is not called God in any part of the Scripture; and that we are so bold as to call him so, though the Fathers of the Church scrupled to give him that name. Will you be a follower of that Antitrinitarian?"

"*Pris.* We neither follow Erasmus, nor Hilary; but we follow the Scripture, as they did."

"*Inq.* What does it signify, that the Holy Spirit be not called *God* in the Scripture, since he himself has taught Mother Church to call him so, as it appears by St. Athanasius's Creed? But, if you believe the Scripture, why don't you believe the Divinity of our Lord?"

"*Pris.* God forbid I should deny the Divinity of Christ! We believe that he is a divine and heavenly person; which is the reason why you put us to death."

"*Inq.* It is not true. We put you to death, because you will not believe, that Christ took his flesh from Mary his Mother."

"*Pris.* We believe that 'the word was made flesh.'"

"*Inq.* Christ says, 'I and my Father are one;' and elsewhere, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'"

"*Pris.* Christ says, also, 'That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe, that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' See also the Acts of the Apostles, iv. 32, and Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, iii. 28, and the Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 31."

"*Inq.* You have sucked the poisoned breast of Erasmus.

* APPENDIX, No. i.

But, what will you answer to these words of Christ, ‘He, that hath seen me, hath seen the Father’?”

“*Pris.* Christ says also, ‘No one hath seen the Father, but he who is of God.’ And in another place, ‘No one hath seen God at any time:’ and elsewhere, ‘My Father is greater than I.’ Compare this with Mark xiii. 32.—It plainly appears from all those passages, that the Father was not made flesh.”

“*Inq.* You must not pretend to teach me that. I repeat it:—Christ, the second person of the Deity, or of the Holy Trinity, was made man. You refuse to call him God.”

“*Pris.* I call him ‘the Son of the living God,’ as Peter does, and ‘the Lord,’ as the other Apostles call him. He is called in the Acts of the Apostles, ‘Jesus of Nazareth—whom God raised from the dead.’ And Paul calls him ‘that man—by whom God shall judge the world in righteousness.’”

“*Inq.* These are the wretched arguments of the cursed Erasmus, in his small treatise ‘On Prayer,’ and in his ‘Apology to the Bishop of Seville.’ If you are contented to call Christ ‘the Son of God,’ you do not give him a more eminent title, than that which St. Luke gives to Adam, whom he calls also ‘the son of God.’”

“*Pris.* God forbid! We believe that the body of Christ is not earthly, like that of Adam; but that he is a heavenly man, as Paul says.”

“*Inq.* Do you believe that Christ is neither true man, nor true God? What is he then?”

“*Pris.* Christ is the true Son of God, as John says, in his first Epistle. He is also a true man, as Paul witnesses.”

“*Inq.* But does not St. John say in the same Chapter, that the Son is ‘the true God’?”

“*Pris.* No; for John says, ‘We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we

may know him that is true ; and we are in him that is true, in his Son, Jesus Christ. He is the true God, and eternal life :’ that is, the God, whom the Son has manifested to us.”

“*Inq.* But St. John says, in the same Chapter : ‘ There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit ; and these three are one.’ ”

“*Pris.* I have often heard, that Erasmus, in his Annotations upon that passage, shews that this text is not in the Greek original.”

Upon this, Brother Cornelius, turning to the Secretary and Clerk of the Inquisition, who were present at this Dialogue, said :—“ Gentlemen, what do you think of all this ? Am I to blame, because I attack so frequently, in my Sermons, Erasmus, that wicked, that cursed Antitrinitarian ? It is certain he says so : but this is worse still. He says, in his Annotations upon Luke iv., that a strange falsification has crept into the holy Scripture, by adding or omitting some words, on account of the heretics. Nay, he says that some marginal notes, which had been made by private men, have been inserted in the text. This Antitrinitarian, whom you see here, and the arch-heretic, Erasmus, have the boldness to tell us, that we have added these words, ‘ who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen,’ in Rom. ix. 5. Or, they say that these words are only a doxology, and that they ought to be translated thus : ‘ of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all. God be blessed for ever. Amen.’ Erasmus suspects that these words have been added, and pretends that the like additions are to be found in other passages ; these, for instance, ‘ Tu autem Domine,’ &c. ‘ Gloria Patri, et Filio,’ &c., and such other expressions, with which we usually conclude the lessons and prayers of the Church. As for the words of St. Thomas, ‘ My Lord, and my God !’ he knows not

what to make of them; and yet he has the insolence to observe, that this is the only passage in the Scripture, in which Christ is called *God*." Then, turning to Van Flekwyk, he said, "Let us see, master Antitrinitarian, what you have to say upon these last words."

"*Pris.* Thomas expressed himself rightly; for, does not David say, in the eighty-second Psalm, 'I said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High'? And Christ alleges the same words, to shew that he might call himself 'the Son of God.' See also Exodus xx. 8, 9."

"*Inq.* Answer this question. How comes it, that Christ did not say to Thomas, 'I am not thy God'?"

"*Pris.* The words of David and John, above mentioned, may serve as an answer to this question. Tell me, in your turn, why Christ did not say to Thomas, after he had spoken the words in question, 'I will build my Church upon this rock,' as he said to Peter, when that Apostle declared that he was 'the Christ, the Son of the living God'? Nor did Christ say to Thomas, 'Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven.' And why did Christ tell his Apostles, 'I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God'? Why did he say, 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me'?"

"*Inq.* But if Christ is not God, how comes it that we call the holy Virgin, 'Mother of God'?"

"*Pris.* It is because those of your communion generally affect to speak a different language from that of Scripture. The Virgin is called in Scripture 'the mother of Jesus,' and never 'the mother of God.'"

"*Inq.* Do you think we stick much to the bare words of Scripture? The holy Council of Nice has decreed, that the Virgin should be called 'mother of God.'"

“*Pris.* Don’t you believe, that the Council of Trent is as holy and venerable as that of Nice?”

“*Inq.* Yes, certainly; for the Holy Spirit has instructed us by this last Council, as well as by the Fathers of the Council of Nice.”

“*Pris.* The Council of Trent has enabled me to judge of other Councils. The conduct of that assembly must needs give us a very bad opinion of the former Councils.”

On hearing this, Brother Cornelius strongly inveighed against the prisoner. He called him “a blasphemer against the Holy Ghost,” “Beëlzebub,” “a diabolical Antitrinitarian,” and “an enemy of the mother of God.”

“*Pris.* You acknowledge that there are three persons in the Holy Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that these three persons are but one God. The Virgin Mary is, therefore, the mother of the Father and the Holy Spirit, as well as of the Son.”

“*Inq.* Have I not demonstrated to you, by the Creed of St. Athanasius, that ‘the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet that there are not three Gods, but one God’?”

“*Pris.* If each of the three persons is not a distinct God; if the three persons jointly are but one God; it follows, that the Virgin is the mother of the three persons. If it be so, what will become of your Council of Nice?”

“*Inq.* May you be roasted in hell fire, you wicked and abominable Antitrinitarian! You would make a hundred thousand Doctors of Divinity mad.”

Such was the substance of Brother Cornelius’s conversation with Hermann Van Flekwyk. We learn from it, how a comparatively illiterate Baptist teacher, was enabled, with the help of a plain understanding, an honest and upright mind, and such casual helps as the time afforded him, to become an overmatch for one, who could only support

his arbitrary, unscriptural positions, by human authority, and the sophistry of the schools.

VIDEND *Sandii* B. A. p. 60. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 986. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Reformation, &c. in and about the Low Countries, Bk. x. A.D. 1599. *De la Roche's* Abridgment. Lond. 1725, 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 123—131. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Chap. i. pp. 20—27.

84.

JOHN SYLVANUS was a Tyrolese, of Etschland, on the banks of the Adige. He was first a Catholic; then a Lutheran; and finally an Antitrinitarian. Sandius says that he was Inspector or Comptroller of Ladenburg; and alludes to a report of his having been Superintendent of the Churches of the Palatinate of the Rhine. But Bock denies that he ever held the latter of these two offices. He was tutor to Frederick, Elector Palatine; by whose authority he was beheaded, on a charge of heresy, in the year 1571. Lubieniecus describes him as a man of learning and integrity. He wrote

1. A Letter to Paul Scalichius, dated Feb. 17th, 1558, in which he ingenuously exposed the abuses and errors of the Romish Church.

2. A Book against the Lutheran Church, composed about the same time, for the purpose of freeing himself from the suspicion of being favourable to the doctrines of that Church. *MS.*

3. Christliche Bekanntniss Johannis Sylvani Athesini, mit einer Vorrede Johannis Brentzen: Tubing. 1560, 8vo. This Confession is dedicated to Balthasar de Gültlingen; and is divided into three Books, of which the first treats upon the authority of Scripture and the Church, and the second and third upon the articles of faith controverted between the members of the Reformed Church and the Catholics.

4. Neue Zeitung wie ein Bild geredt, klagt und bekannt

habe, zur Warnung sich vor allem Götzenleben zu hüten : mit einer Vorrede Johannis Sylvani Athesini. Tubing. 1561, 8vo. This is dedicated to the Free Baron, John Ungnad.

5. Wahre Christliche Bekenntniß des uralten Glaubens von dem einigen wahren Gott, und von Messia Jesu der wahren Christen ; wieder den dreypersönlichen Abgott und zwey naturten Götzen des Wiederchristen. 1570. This is probably the work, to which Sandius refers, as “*Contra Eutychn. errorem, Germanice.* 8vo.”

6. A Letter to Blandrata.

7. Another Letter to Frederick III., Elector Palatine, to whom he relates, how he drew over Matthias Vehe to his party, and longed to visit Transylvania.

8. Two Books against John Marbach. 1565-6, 8vo.

9. Some other writings of Sylvanus are mentioned in the “*Epitome Bibl. Gesn.*”

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 60, 61. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 970—973.

85.

ADAM NEUSER, (or NEUSNER, as the name is written by Sandius,) was Minister of St. Peter's Church, at Heidelberg. About the year 1565, a controversy arose in that city respecting Church Government. Till then, excommunication had not been resorted to ; and C. Olevianus was constantly urging the adoption of the discipline, observed in the Church of Geneva. This was strenuously resisted by Christopher Probus, Thomas Lieber, (better known by the name of *Erastus*,) and Adam Neuser, who disapproved of this discipline as tyrannical. Neuser said, that he opposed it as false, and repugnant to the word of God ; and both Erastus and he took every opportunity of speaking and writing against it. No long time after this, it was found that Neuser disbelieved the doctrine of the

Trinity; and he was banished on account of his opinions. Sandius refers to a manuscript letter, which Neuser wrote to the Ambassador of John Sigismund, Prince of Transylvania, at the Court of the Emperor, Maximilian II.; and says, that this letter was intercepted, and that its contents led to the apprehension and imprisonment of Adam Neuser and John Sylvanus. James Suter and Matthias Glirius seem also to have been involved in the consequences of this transaction.

The learned Samuel Crellius represents Neuser as having been the first, in modern times, who taught the pure humanity of Christ, as it was afterwards adopted, and professed by Simon Budnæus and Francis Davidis. Sandius relates, that it was when Neuser had exercised the ministerial function about ten years, that his imprisonment took place in the Lower Palatinate; and Budzinius describes his providential escape, and flight into Transylvania, in the year 1571. "Socinianism," says Mosheim, "was introduced into Germany by Adam Neuser, and other emissaries, who infected the Palatinate with its errors, having entered into a league with the Transylvanians, at the critical period when the affairs of the Unitarians in Poland carried a dubious and unpromising aspect. But this pernicious league was soon detected, and the schemes of its authors entirely blasted and disconcerted; upon which Neuser went into Turkey, and enlisted among the Janizaries."

This account of Mosheim represents Neuser as going of his own accord into Turkey: but Chytræus says, that he was taken up as a spy at Clausenberg, and *sent* to Constantinople. Zeltner, who refers to this account of Chytræus, conjectures that Neuser, under these circumstances, found it expedient to make a formal profession of Mahometanism, in order to save his life; and, in confirmation

of this conjecture, refers to Heineccius's Appendix to the Description of the Greek Church.

What has been said on the subject of Neuser's apostasy rests chiefly on the testimony of Stephen Gerlach, a Lutheran Divine, who went to Constantinople, in the month of August, 1573, in the capacity of Domestic Chaplain to the Baron Ungnad Von Weissenwolf, Austrian Ambassador at the Porte. Gerlach says, that he saw Adam Neuser there, and conversed with him ; and that, on asking him how he arrived at such a pitch of error, he replied, "If I had not been a Calvinist, I should never have come to this." A fragment of a letter is referred to, which Neuser is said to have written to Gerlach at Constantinople, dated July 2nd, 1574, and containing the following passage. "No writer in our time, who is known to me, has become an Arian, who was not previously a Calvinist, as Servetus, Blandrata, Paul Alciati, Francis Davidis, Gentilis, Gribaldus, Sylvanus, and others. Let him, therefore, who fears lest he should fall into Arianism, beware of Calvinism." There is also a letter, addressed by Gerlach to Martin Crusius, and written in the year 1575, containing an account of Neuser's apostasy. But Ruarus seems to doubt the truth of the whole narrative ; and Fabricius is equally incredulous respecting it. The fact probably was, as Zeltner conjectures, that Neuser, being banished to Constantinople, and finding himself in a situation, in which the safety of his life depended upon his making a profession of the Mahometan faith, he had not the courage to remain steadfast to his Christian principles, and outwardly conformed to the religion of the country, as a means of self-preservation. Nor is there anything inconsistent with this supposition, in the account given by Gerlach : for it is evident, that Neuser felt the degradation of his position, when he said, that he should not have become what he

was, if he had never been a Calvinist. Henry Altingius calls the truth of this relation in question, because Wenceslaüs Budowez, who gives an account of the latter part of Neuser's life, has not mentioned it: but no such inference can be fairly drawn from the silence of Budowez, respecting a private conversation with another person.

In a work entitled, "*Monumenta Pietatis et Literar. Virorum in Republ. et Literaria Illustrium selecta*," published at Frankfort on the Maine, at the beginning of the last century, is inserted at full length, "A Letter to Selim II., Emperor of the Turks," in which the writer professes Mahometanism, and offers to throw himself upon the Sultan's protection. But the early date of this Letter, (1570,) and the lateness of its publication, (1701,) conspire to render it probable, that it is a forgery. The intercepted letter, which led to Neuser's imprisonment, was not written till the year 1571; and it is very unlikely, that he should have solicited the protection of the Sultan before that time. Besides, if such a document had been in existence, why was it allowed to remain in concealment through the whole of the seventeenth century, when its production would have been of great service to the Trinitarian cause? It has been shewn, too, that the defection of Neuser was not premeditated; that the profession of Mahometanism was forced upon him by a concurrence of unforeseen circumstances; and that he himself deeply deplored the step, which he had been compelled to take, for the purpose of ensuring his own safety. He died, October 12th, 1576, of an incurable disease, attended with the most excruciating pains and sufferings, which some have regarded as a judgment upon him for his apostasy.

In addition to the letters already mentioned, namely, the one to the Transylvanian Ambassador, and the one to Stephen Gerlach, we find attributed to Neuser, "Theses

concerning the Person of Christ," and remarks on "The Scope of the seventh Chapter to the Romans." The former he is said to have composed in prison, about the end of the year 1570. The latter were written in 1572, and published in 1583, with some other tracts relating to the Christian religion, to which allusion has already been made, in the account of Matthias Glirius. (Vide Art. 81.)

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 61. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 525, 526. *Melchioris Adami* Vit. Germ. Theolog. p. 388. *Hornii* Hist. Eccles. pp. 652—654. *Mosh.* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § xiv. xxii. p. 723, Not. k. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. pp. 73. 1223, 1224. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 47. *Althoerden*, Hist. Mich. Serveti, p. 6. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. ii. C. v. p. 108; L. iii. C. iv. pp. 198—201. Stephan Gerlachs dess Aeltern Tage-Buch, u. s. w. Franckf. am M. 1674; Oct. 1573; Nov. Dec. 1574; Jun. Aug. 1575; Apr. Sept. Oct. Dec. 1576.

86.

JAMES SUTER was a Preacher in the Reformed Church of the Palatinate, and the companion in misfortune of Adam Neuser and John Sylvanus, the latter of whom prevailed upon him to renounce the doctrine of the Trinity. He was banished, with Matthias Glirius, about the end of the year 1572. Zeltner suspected that he was the same person as James Palæologus; but the suspicion proves to have been unfounded.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 969. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. p. 353, Not. b, et Not. in Epist. Ruari, p. 176.

87.

JOHN MATTHEUS, or MATTHES, according to Bock, was a name altogether unknown to the writers whom he consulted; and was classed for the first time, by himself, among those of Antitrinitarian patrons and teachers. He was one of those, who, in the Palatinate of the Rhine, made common cause with Sylvanus and Neuser. He had taken refuge in the Austrian territories; but on the 24th of June,

1578, sentence of banishment was pronounced against him, in the name of the Emperor, Rudolph II. Bock thinks it clear, that John Mattheus is a different person from Matthias Vehe, otherwise called Glirius, who was banished from the Palatinate for the same heresy; and the ground of his opinion is, that *Mattheus*, and not *Matthias*, is the name used in the Emperor's decree.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 465, 466.

88.

ANDREW DUDITHIUS, or DUDITIUS, (also called DUDICZ, or DUDITZ,) of Horehowitza, was surnamed SBARDELLATUS, from the family of his mother, and born at or near Buda, in Hungary, on the 16th of February, 1533. His father was a Hungarian Noble; and his mother was of an illustrious Venetian family. While yet an infant, he lost his father in the Turkish war; but his mother survived, and was living as late as the year 1572.

In his boyhood he received an excellent education; and made considerable proficiency in Latin, and the science of Rhetoric. But he paid particular attention to the study of History and Politics, of which he afterwards experienced the advantage, in the various diplomatic missions in which he was engaged. Thomas Crenius describes him as “trium Imperatorum Consiliarius et Orator, Tullianæ eloquentiæ Sectator admirabilis, vir litteris insigniter excultus, et rerum Politicarum usu probatus.”

Melchior Adam relates, on the authority of Charles Oslewski, that he was brought up with Stephen Bathory, Prince of Transylvania, who afterwards became King of Poland. The truth of this statement has been questioned by Cel. Schwartz: but it is certain that he was a fellow-student of this Prince, in the University of Padua. From that time, however, he conceived an unconquerable dislike

to the Prince, whom he calls, in his letters, “a vile Turkish slave,” and other opprobrious names, and accuses of perfidy and impurity; and whose election as King of Poland he did all in his power to prevent.

Being born of Catholic parents, Dudithius was taught, as a child, to hate Protestants, and imbued with a zeal for the rites and ceremonies of the Romish Church. As he grew up, his cousin, Augustin Sbardellatus, Bishop of Vacs, or Waitzen, and afterwards Archbishop of Strigoniun, or Gran, undertook the charge of his education; and, as Hungary was embroiled in war, sent him to Breslau, where he devoted himself to literature, and acquired a knowledge of the German language. Quirinus Reuter informs us, that he then went to Vienna, and spent some time in the Court of the Emperor Ferdinand; but Bock thinks it more probable, that he went from Breslau into Italy, and merely passed through Vienna, on his way thither. During his stay in Italy, his time was divided between Padua and Venice; and at these places he studied under Paul Manutius, Francis Robortellus, Charles Sigonius, Onuphrius Panvinus, P. Victorius, and other eminent teachers, with whom he lived on terms of friendship. Paul Manutius had so high an opinion of him, that, in his letters, addressed to various learned men, he ranks him among the greatest geniuses of the age. His fondness for Cicero was such, that at three separate times, he transcribed the whole of his works with his own hand. From Italy he went into France, and at Paris devoted himself to the study of Philosophy, and the languages of Scripture, to which he added that of several of the oriental dialects. His instructor in Greek was Angelo Canini; in Hebrew, John le Mercier; in Philosophy, Francis Vicomercatus. When he had finished his studies at Paris, he returned to his native country; and his cousin, the Archbishop, after a short

time, sent him again to Padua, to study Jurisprudence, with a view to qualify him for some civil office. Here he became acquainted with the celebrated Cardinal Pole, who, being a patron of merit, took notice of him, and admitted him to his table, while yet a stripling; and when the Cardinal went to England, to congratulate Queen Mary on her accession to the throne, Dudithius accompanied him thither. Having spent a twelvemonth in England, he returned to Hungary, according to Reuter; but to Paris, according to De Thou, for the purpose of resuming his studies, which had been suspended during his travels. Bock thinks it most probable, that he returned from England directly to his native country; and thence went a third time into Italy, and a second time into France. On his way from Italy into France, he visited the Florentine Court, and paid his respects to Catharine de Medicis, who expressed her surprise, at hearing a native Hungarian speak Italian with perspicuity and elegance. He made some stay at Vienna, on his return from France; and about the year 1560, received two appointments from the King of Hungary. One of these was a Charge at the Upper Baths of Baden, and the other a Canonry in the metropolitan Church of Strigonium. He was in great favour with the Emperor Ferdinand; but Reuter is mistaken in supposing, that he was at this time admitted to the office of a Privy Councillor of the Emperor. Schwartz has proved, that he did not arrive at that honour till some years later. But in 1561, he obtained from Ferdinand the Bishoprick of Tina, in Dalmatia, in which he was confirmed by Pope Paul IV., on the 28th of January, 1562; but he did not enter upon the duties of his episcopal office, because Dalmatia was then in possession of the Turks.

In the same year, the Hungarian clergy chose him to be their joint representative with John Sylvester, of Clausen-

burg, Bishop of Chonad, at the Council of Trent, where he spoke at considerable length on five several occasions. He arrived at Trent in the month of February, and took his seat in the Council, with his colleague, on the 6th of April; but was called home by the Emperor about the end of the year, before the Council had finished its sittings. It has been suspected, that Dudithius was not a Catholic, when he undertook this mission; and some affirm, that he was recalled, at the request and solicitation of the Pope, who had learnt, through his Legates, that many of the assembled Bishops were in danger of being brought over to his party, by his eloquence and arguments. But what he said and did at Trent was said and done by a man, who was entirely devoted to the See of Rome. On his return, the Emperor Ferdinand approved of his conduct at Trent; and, as a mark of his approbation and favour, presented him, in the month of May, 1563, with the Bishoprick of Chonad, and that of Fünfkirche, or the Five Churches; and made him a Privy Councillor.

In the year 1565, Dudithius was sent by Maximilian, Emperor of Austria, to the Court of Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, to bring about a reconciliation between the latter and his Queen, who was sister to the Emperor, and had formerly been married to the Duke of Mantua; or to obtain permission for her to leave Poland, which the Emperor had formerly requested in vain. Dudithius used all the arts of persuasion of which he was master, to bring about a reconciliation; but all that he could accomplish, after much negotiation, was, to obtain permission for the Queen to be sent to her brother. She accompanied Dudithius from Lithuania to Cracow, whence, having left the greater part of her train, with her female attendants, she proceeded with Dudithius to the Emperor, who was then at Vienna. It was the Emperor's pleasure, however, that

Dudithius should go back to Poland, with the title of *Perpetual Internuncio*. He, therefore, returned to Cracow.

In the mean time Dudithius was favourably inclined towards the Protestants, with whose Teachers and Ministers he had great facilities for becoming acquainted, and holding frequent intercourse, on his journeys. We learn, from the Preface to Modrevius's "*Sylvæ*," that as early as the year 1565, he was agitated by various doubts respecting the Roman Catholic religion; and that he came to the determination of marrying. Two years afterwards he carried this resolution into effect, by forming a matrimonial alliance with Regina Strass, who had been a Maid of Honour to Catharine, Queen of Poland. But he wished the marriage to be kept secret, till he had discharged the duties of his embassy, and arranged his domestic affairs in Hungary. We must date his secession from the Romish Church, however, from his marriage in 1567; and may ascribe it principally to the celibacy enjoined on the Romish clergy, and to his conscientious advocacy of the communion of both kinds.

On becoming a Protestant, he resigned his Bishoprick; but the Emperor continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, and he was burnt in effigy at Rome: but all this he treated with contempt. He formed the determination of spending the remainder of his life on the confines of Poland, and was accordingly naturalized in that country; and having obtained the rank of a Polish Noble, he was enabled to purchase from Stanislaus Cichovius the town of Smigel, in Great Poland, on the borders of Silesia. Here he built a Protestant place of worship, and established a School at his own expense; and thus became the founder and patron of the Church of Smigel, the first Minister of which was John Krotovius. (Vide *Art.* 89.)

Soon after his marriage, Dudithius left his wife with her mother in Poland, and went into Hungary, to obtain the Emperor's sanction to his resignation of the diplomatic office which he held, and to take his formal leave of public life. Maximilian granted his request, but not without reluctance, for he was unwilling to lose the services of Dudithius, and yet would not insist upon his retaining, against his will, the office of Perpetual Internuncio. On his return into Poland, he fixed his abode at Cracow, and entered into a correspondence with Beza, and other Divines of the Helvetic Confession; and it is said that, in consequence of his renunciation of Catholicism, combined with the influence of his personal character, and his great eminence as a scholar, the cause of the evangelical party in Hungary was much extended.

On the death of Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, the last of the race of Jagellon, in 1572, the throne of that country became vacant; and Dudithius, who was under the greatest obligations to the House of Austria, endeavoured, both by his speeches and writings, to induce the Poles to elect the Emperor Maximilian, or his son Ernest, King. But the French party proved the stronger; and the majority of the Nobles being in the interest of Henry of Valois, the election was decided in his favour. Henry, however, having resigned the crown of Poland after a reign of about two years, and having returned to France to take possession of his hereditary kingdom, Dudithius again made common cause with those, who wished for the election of the Emperor Maximilian, or some Austrian Prince. But the party with which he acted was again left in a minority; and the choice fell upon Stephen Bathory. Dudithius, however, resolved that he would never acknowledge Bathory as King; and was compelled to quit Poland with his family, in the month of February, or March, 1576, on

account of the hostility which his continued opposition to the claims of the new monarch had raised against him.

About three years before this, death had deprived him of his wife; and he was left a widower, with three young children, two sons and a daughter. He felt his loss acutely, but on account of the education of his children, he entered into a second matrimonial connexion with Elizabeth Zborovia, or Zborowska, widow of John Tarnovius, whom Smalcus praises, as a most pious and modest matron. Being driven, with the whole of his family, out of the Polish territory, in the year 1576, he withdrew to Bylitz, a town of Upper Silesia, fourteen miles distant from Cracow, and at that time subject to Charles Pronnitz. In this year, the Emperor Maximilian died, but he retained his affection for Dudithius to the end; and one of the latest acts of his reign was to give orders to the Magistrates of Breslau to receive Dudithius, and treat him kindly, and to grant him liberty to go where he pleased. But he settled with his family in Moravia, and remained there, in the Principality of Paskow, by the kind permission of the Emperor Rudolph, whose Councillor he continued, with the customary pension, during that monarch's life; and who conferred upon him the privileges of a free Baron of Moravia. In this retreat he spent his time in the midst of literary pursuits, was visited by some of the most learned men of the day, and composed his treatise on Comets. But at the expiration of two years, tired of the obscurity of this place, and of the disputes in which he was involved with the neighbouring boors, he left it, and went, as he had originally intended, to Breslau, where he had spent the pleasantest part of his youth; and where he remained during the rest of his life, devoting himself wholly to literary occupations, and to the society of learned men.

It is said, that Dudithius sold his estates in Hungary and

Poland ; and lent the money, produced by the sale of them, to the Emperor Rudolph on moderate interest. But he often complains in his letters, that the interest is not punctually paid ; and that his salary and pension are in arrears. Of his mode of life at this time he writes as follows to his friend, John Crato, of Crafftheim, in a letter, dated June 12th, 1580. “ Here am I, living in a noble and populous city, in such a way, that the principal streets are not yet known to me, and very few of the inhabitants. I rarely go out anywhere before Sunday, except when some one invites me to a meal ; and that very seldom happens. I live with my family in the midst of a great desert ; I have one or two friends ; but I very rarely see them.” He now withdrew himself altogether from public affairs ; and when, in 1587, Maximilian, Duke of Austria, was a rival candidate for the crown of Poland with Sigismund, hereditary Prince of Sweden, he took no interest whatever in the election.

About the end of the year 1579, he commenced a correspondence with Faustus Socinus, soon after the arrival of that eminent reformer in Poland ; and the letter addressed to him by Dudithius appears to have been very complimentary. The correspondence extended from the year 1580 to 1583, and in the course of it Dudithius proposed various questions to Socinus on religious subjects, expressed doubts about certain parts of Socinius’s writings, and was far from agreeing with him in all things. He spent nearly ten years at Breslau ; and although he had very little society at first, yet, as time advanced, the circle of his acquaintance extended, and he had a great influx of visitors from Poland. Hence suspicions arose, and the clergy evinced a disposition to trouble him, on account of his religious opinions : but he appealed to the Emperor, and was allowed to pass the remainder of his life in peace.

Two days before his death, he addressed a letter to his friend Prætorius, an eminent mathematician, at the end of which, after proposing various mathematical questions, he wrote these words with his own hand. "On the 15th of this month, there was a lunar eclipse in Aquarius, which is my horoscope. If Astrology is true, it either brings death to me, or some very grievous disease. What think you?" At length, on the 23rd of February, 1589, just a week after he had completed the fifty-sixth year of his age, with scarcely any preceding disease, he calmly breathed his last at Breslau, in the presence of his wife and children, ejaculating, at short intervals, the words, "O, Lord Jesus, save me!" The medical men who attended him differed as to the cause of his death, some supposing that it was caused by the breaking of an ulcer in the lungs, and others that it was the result of apoplexy. "That his death *followed* that eclipse," says Prætorius, "I regard as a matter of no importance whatever. What if consternation killed him?"

His body was interred in the church of St. Elizabeth, the principal one of the city, without any funeral pomp; and his widow erected to his memory a monument in black marble, bearing the following inscription. "D. O. M. S. ANDREÆ DUDITHII ab Horechowieza Dno. in Smigla; antiquiss. prosapia, virtute singulari, eruditione multiiuga, diuersissimarum linguarum excellenti cognitione, plurimarumque et maximarum rerum usu vere illustri et incomparabili viro III. Imp. FERDINANDI I. MAXIMILIANI II. RUDOLPHI II. Consiliario; summis honorum, tum sacris, tum profanis, legationibusque ampliss. apud exteros Reges et Dynastas, maxima cum laude perfuncto; carissimo omnibus; adverso nemini, cunctis admirationi, marito exoptatissimo atque desideratissimo, suo et liberorum nomine multis cum lacrymis posuit. ELISABETHA, ex illustri et

amplissima SBOROVIORUM familia oriunda, quæ, ut in hac vita, cum dulcissimo conjuge per annos decem conjunctissime vixit, ita ne mortuum quidem deserere, sed cum eodem, in eodem sepulchro quiescere voluit. Vixit maritus ann. 56, d. 7, obiit Breslæ 23 Febr. MDLXXXIX. Illa vixit — Obiit —." The blanks at the end of this inscription were never filled up. Dudithius's widow returned to Poland after her husband's death, and became a member of the Socinian Church; and dying in the month of October, 1601, was buried on the 10th of Dec., at Czarcow. Dudithius had several children by this lady, one of whom, named Regina, was married to Jerome Moscorovius, Oct. 2nd, 1593. His elder son by the first marriage was named Andrew, and received his education under Quirinus Reuter, and Solomon Gesner. The three surviving sons of the second marriage, Alexander, Daniel and Jerome, were placed under the care of Smalcus, who had the charge of the School of Smigel, built by their father. They remained there till the year 1598; but when Smalcus removed to Lublin, in 1599, Moscorovius took the two younger ones to Luclavice, where they continued for some time with their tutor, in the house of Peter Statorius. Jerome, the youngest, died on the 7th of July, 1612, at Czarcow, and left a widow in very reduced circumstances.

The library of Dudithius contained many valuable works, both printed and in manuscript; but what became of it, after the death of its possessor, is unknown. The biographical accounts of Dudithius are numerous, but that of Quirinus Reuter is the best. Those authors, who have described his character, speak of him as of a mild and gentle disposition; of quick perception, excellent judgment, and great prudence; and so rigidly temperate, that he abstained from the use of wine, and all intoxicating liquors. He took great interest in the welfare of Faustus Socinus, and

put him on his guard against the wiles of the Jesuits, and others. He seems himself to have had a great dread of death; and to have wondered that his friend did not participate in the same feeling. Socinus, in the course of their correspondence, had expressed his readiness to yield up his life in the cause of truth; and seemed even desirous of martyrdom. Dudithius reproved him for giving utterance to such wishes; and the answer of Socinus, from which the following passage is taken, strikingly illustrates the different characters of the two men. "I don't think," says Socinus, "that I said I desired death; but only this, that I should *esteem it a great favour*, if God saw fit, to *undergo death* for his truth, and be conformed in this respect not only to others whom he has loved, but also to his only and best beloved Son, my Lord. Neither can I dissemble, that it has often appeared surprising to me that you should intimate you have different thoughts, and should declare it as your wish, that you may not be obliged to lay down your life as a martyr for Christ. Why so? Is it that a little may be added to the residue of your years? Of how great value, I pray you, if your death was left to your own choice, are those few decads of years you may continue longer in this life? Indeed, what would be even ages, and thousands of years that must at last come to an end? Recollect those words that deserve to be written in letters of gold, which a man, destitute of the true knowledge of God, and of all solid hope of another life after the present uttered: 'Nothing appears to me lasting which has an end; for when that arrives, what is passed has fled away: that only remains, which you have obtained by virtue, and right conduct.'—Perhaps you may plead, your meaning was, that you might not endure and feel the agonies and distresses attendant on martyrdom. But in what light are these to be viewed, when God affords strength to support them

patiently and cheerfully out of love to him, but as a pledge and earnest given to a Christian of future immortality and blessedness. Therefore, on no account, unless I am mistaken, should we, who profess Christianity, declare that we wish not to be numbered among the martyrs for Christ; especially before those who pay little regard to religion, and who will seize the advantage afforded them by such kind of speeches, to harden their minds in their lukewarmness, and to believe that our hearts do not glow with zeal for it. I suppose you will clearly perceive my meaning, and therefore I shall not use more words to express it. I only request this, that you will excuse my freedom, since I think it my duty thus to address you." (F. Socini Opera, T. I. p. 509.)

As regards the religious opinions of Dudithius, the assertions, made by his different biographers, are various and contradictory. Some have charged him with Atheism; others have stigmatized him as a heretic. Some have asserted, others have denied, that he lapsed into Arianism. The truth is, as may be collected from his own writings, and the Synodical Acts of the Unitarian Churches, he agreed on all fundamental points with them; and urged, if not a union of all religions, yet a toleration of them. But he never made any public confession, and was not formally admitted into communion with the Socinians. Motives of policy induced him to avoid this; although, as we have already seen, he was the founder, and patron of the Church at Smigel. In a letter to Beza, he confesses that he derived his opinion concerning God, and his Son Jesus Christ, principally from the published writings of Blandrata and Davidis; but solemnly affirms that he never saw either of them, and consequently, that he could not have been biassed by any prepossession in their favour. Ruarus, in reply to a letter of Vincentius Frisius, says, "Dudithius

embraced the opinion of Socinus concerning God and Christ, and never departed from it, as far as I know. On other subjects, not a few of his sentiments coincided with those of Socinus. But when he found, that, from one of his letters to John a Lasco, and another to John Crato, his reputation was in danger, he began to conceal his opinion." (Epp. Cent. i. N. 99.) Sandius says, that "he joined the followers of Calvin; but when he found that they stood in need of reformation in many things, and especially when he saw their bitterness towards the worshipers of the One God, he withdrew from them, and joined the Unitarians, embracing their opinion, which he professed and propagated to his death." (B. A. p. 61.)

The following is an extract of a letter, dated Cracow, 1570, assuring Beza, that he speaks to him with the utmost frankness, as to a friend. "The disciples of the Apostles never burnt any person for not according with them in belief; they neither sent any into exile, nor armed others against their Sovereigns; neither did they ever publish any statutes, giving authority for establishing religion by force. Tell me, I pray you, according to that reformation of the Gospel, which you believe is nowhere preserved in its purity, but among yourselves, how is it, that all sorts of crimes are committed with impunity? Is not every place stained with the blood of a number of persons shed by you? Have not snares been laid by you for Princes and Magistrates? And are not rewards proposed for thieves and assassins to excite them to murder, in inspiring them with the hope of eternal salvation? * * * Has the Christian religion any need of such defenders? Did Christ, your Master, put arms into your hands to defend his cause?" (F. Socini Opera, T. I. p. 517.) In another letter to John Wolfius, Minister of the Church at Zurich, Dudithius represents to him the inconsistency of the Calvinists, in

accusing the Catholics of cruelty, as the Reformed are worse than they! This he illustrates by the examples of Servetus, Valentine Gentilis, and many others, whom they put to death for their belief. He charges the Calvinists of Zurich with banishing the aged Ochinus, with his wife and family, in the depth of winter, without even giving them a hearing. He describes the inhospitable treatment which Lasco, and the Church of the Strangers experienced at the hands of the Calvinists, who refused them shelter in every place to which they came, in the most inclement season of the year. Dudithius, after that, could not suppose that they would have the effrontery to reproach the Catholics with the cruelty and tyranny of the Church of Rome! (Ibid. p. 516.)

Bock infers, from a letter addressed by Dudithius to his friend Prætorius, that persons, holding the religious sentiments of Socinus, were in the habit of assembling in his house at Breslau, not long before his death; and he justly remarks, that the suspicion of his being a Socinian is not a little increased by this circumstance, as well as by the fact, that all his surviving family,—wife, sons and daughters,—openly joined the Socinians after his death. “In the mean time,” he observes, “we think that a full judgment concerning his private opinions, towards the end of his life, must be left to the omniscient Searcher of hearts. That he at one time impugned the doctrine of the Trinity is placed beyond all doubt, by proofs in abundance; that he really repented of his error, there is not a single argument to prove.” (Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 293, 294.) During his residence at Breslau, he attended public worship at the Calvinistic Lutheran Church, where he also partook, at stated times, of the Lord’s Supper; but this he probably did, like many others, who were strenuous advocates of

the opinions of Socinus, merely to shew the world, that he had ceased to be a Catholic.

Dudithius was a voluminous author. A full account of his writings is given by Bock, of which the following is little more than an abridgment.

1. A Short Commentary on the Signification of Comets, first printed at Basle, in 1579, 4to., and dedicated to Nicholas Mieleczki, Palatine of Cracow. This treatise was reprinted by Peter Perna, in a collection of tracts on the same subject, in 1586, 4to. A third edition was put forth by Elias Major, at Breslau, in 1619, 8vo.; a fourth at Jena, in 1665, 4to.; and a fifth at Utrecht, in the same year, 4to. In this little work, Dudithius denies that comets are productive causes of physical, or prognostics of moral evil.

2. Thirty-eight Letters on Medical Subjects in Laurence Scholtz's Volume of Philosophical, Medical and Chemical Epistles. Frankf. 1598, Fol.; Hanover, 1610, Fol.

3. Poems, inserted in the 2nd Vol. of "*Deliciæ Poëtarum Germaniæ*," have been attributed to Dudithius by Sandius and others: but Schwartz, who devoted much attention to the life and writings of Dudithius, was unable to find any production of his, except two epigrams, one of which was addressed to his preceptor, Angelo Canini, and the other to his wife, a short time before his own death. Neither of these epigrams is inserted in the collection above mentioned, which, however, does contain "*Poëms of Nathan. Chytræus on Dudithius.*"

4. Two Speeches delivered at the Council of Trent, in the Name of the Bishops of Hungary. Venice, 1562, 4to.; Brescia, 1562; Paris, Frankfort on the Maine, Hanover and Padua, 1563. These speeches, with a third, On the Use of the Cup in the Lord's Supper, which had been

separately printed at Padua in 1563, were inserted in a Collection of the Miscellaneous Works of Quirinus Reuter. Offenbach, 1610, 4to.

5. A Life of Cardinal Pole. Venice, 1563, 4to. This was not an original work of Dudithius, but a Latin translation from the Italian of Ludovico Beccatelli, made during the residence of Dudithius at Padua. The Aldine edition is very scarce; but that of London, 1690, 8vo., may often be met with.

6. An Apology, addressed to Maximilian II., in which the author assigns Reasons for marrying, and for relinquishing the Bishoprick of the Five Churches, and other Ecclesiastical Preferments. This Apology was inserted in the Collection of Reuter, and the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.

7. The Judgment of Dionysius of Halicarnassus concerning the History of Thucydides. Venice, 1560, 4to. This was afterwards inserted in John Bodin's "Methodus Historica," Basle, 1576, 8vo.; 1579, 8vo.; and was reprinted in the Works of Thucydides. Vide "Biblioth. Gesneri, edita a Frisio," f. 43.

8. Two Sets of Notes on F. Socinus's "Disputation concerning Water Baptism." These Notes were printed, with the Disputation to which they relate, at Racow, 1613, 8vo.; and are inserted, together with the reply of Socinus, in the Bibliotheca Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 738—748. Schwartz says, that these Notes were not written by Dudithius, but by Reuter, in proof of which he appeals to Melchior Adam, and to ocular inspection; and yet F. Socinus, who was no doubt well informed upon the subject, expressly attributes them to Dudithius. Bock thinks that Reuter may have been the author of the second set of Notes.

9. Eight Letters in the Bibl. Fratr. Pol. T. I. pp. 510—534. The *first* of these Letters is addressed to John Lasi-

cius, and relates to the Trinity. In the *second*, which is addressed to John Wolfius, Minister of the Church at Zurich, Dudithius discusses the question, "Where is the True and Catholic Church of Jesus Christ to be found?" The *third* is addressed to Theodore Beza, first Minister of the Church of Geneva, and relates to the question, "Whether the name *Church* belongs to the Reformed Church alone?" It is the same with that, which Sandius mentions, (B. A. p. 64,) under the title, "Epistola de Hæreticis non persequendis, et capitali Supplicio afficiendis, Christlingæ, 1584," 8vo.; and which was printed with Minus Celsus's treatise on that subject. The *fourth* and *fifth* are addressed to Peter Melius, Pastor of the Church of Debreczin, in Upper Hungary, to whom Dudithius administers a severe castigation, for his foul abuse of the Socinians. The *sixth* is addressed to Beza, and contains the writer's Confession of Faith concerning God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and animadversions on the Athanasian Creed. The *seventh* is addressed to Josiah Simler and John Wolfius, Divines of Zurich, and contains a modest reply to a letter, which Dudithius had received from the latter, with censures upon those who persecute others for not agreeing with them in matters of religion. The *eighth* is a reply to a letter of Peter Carolius, Minister of Varad, who had endeavoured, but in vain, to appease the just indignation of Dudithius against Peter Melius, for his supercilious and bigoted treatment of the Antitrinitarians.

10. Numerous Letters in Italian, addressed to F. Socinus, in 1580, and succeeding years.

11. A Letter to Justus Lipsius, published in the "Select Letters of Justus Lipsius, Frankf. 1590," No. 91, p. 149; and another to the same, inserted in Peter Burmann's "Sylloge Epistolarum a Viris illustribus scriptarum," T. I. N. 214, p. 215.

12. About three hundred Autograph Letters, preserved, according to Lauterbach, in the Elizabethan Library at Breslau.

13. Another large Collection of Manuscript Letters, formerly in the possession of Prætorius.

14. A Letter to M. Anton. Muretus, written at Padua, in 1559; and inserted in the "Letters of Muretus," edited by James Thomasius, L. i. N. 69, p. 422.

15. A Letter to Joachim Camerarius, the Father, written in 1568; and inserted, by Thomas Crenius, in his "Animad. Phil. et Hist," P. ii. p. 140.

16. A Letter to Christopher Threicius, Rector of the School at Cracow, written about 1571, and inserted in "Epistolæ Præstantium ac Eruditorum Virorum," otherwise called, "Remonstrantium Epistolæ," Amst. 1684 and 1704, Fol. N. 16, p. 32.

17. A Letter to Reimer Reineccius, written in 1581, and inserted in a Book of Historical Letters, addressed to R. R. during sixteen years, Helmst., 1583, Fol. p. 35, b.; and another addressed to John Martellus, in 1580, and inserted in the "Offenbach Collection of Quirinus Reuter."

18. A Valedictory Letter upon Reuter's Book, consecrated to the Memory of Friends, written in 1582, and inserted, by Melchior Adam, in his "Lives of German Theologians," p. 391.

19. A Letter to Solomon Gesner, written in 1588, and prefixed to Gesner's "Commentary on Cicero 'De Fato.'"

20. A Letter to Simon Simonius, written in 1585, a fragment of which was inserted in Simonius's "Simonius Supplex ad incomparabilem Virum," etc. Fol. M. 3.

21. Three Letters to John Prætorius, written in the years 1572, 1585 and 1589, and inserted, by Sigismund James Apinus, in his "Vitæ Professorum Philos. in Acad. Altorf," p. 25.

22. MS. Notes on the “Dialogues of Bernardine Ochinus.” These Notes were written in a copy of Ochinus’s “Dialogues,” which had previously been the property of Valentine Gentilis, and George Blandrata, under whose respective hand-writings Dudithius subscribed the words—“Manus V. Gentilis, Bernæ decollati,”—“Blandratæ Manus.”

23. A small work, On the Greek and Latin Languages, written before the year 1560, of which Dudithius, in the Dedication to his “Judgment of Dionysius of Halicarnassus concerning the History of Thucydides,” says, “If the Greek be compared with the Latin, what, I pray, can be found fuller than the former, what more jejune than the latter? which we have shewn copiously enough, and, as I think, clearly enough, in a little book of ours.”

24. A Proof that Marriage is permitted by the Divine Law to every Order of Men without Exception. This was written at the Diet of Petricow, in 1567; and is inserted in the Collection of Renter, pp. 52—79.

25. Illustrations of the Book of “Demetrius on Interpretation.” These Illustrations were never completed.

26. Dudithius also translated Longinus “On the Sublime” from Greek into Latin, but his version never saw the light; and he meditated, but did not complete, “A Refutation of Atheism.”

27. Paul Manutius mentions with much praise, as having been written by Dudithius, while yet at Padua, “*Commentariolus Argumenti Theologici*,” which began with the words, “*Ita mihi optata contingant;*” but whether it was published, or remained in manuscript, is uncertain. Sandius also speaks of some letters of Dudithius as occurring in the correspondence of Manutius; and refers, from memory, to the “*Bibliotheca Gesneriana*,” as his authority for this statement. (*Bibl. Ant.* p. 63.) The reference is

verified by Bock, who tells us that what Sandius says upon this subject is taken from Casp. Frisius's "Epit. Biblioth. Gesnerianæ," p. 43; but he remarks, at the same time, that the allegation itself appears not to be borne out by fact. He adds, however, that he has not seen the oldest editions of the Epistles of Manutius; and that no letters of Dudithius to Manutius are given in the later ones. He further states, that in the letters addressed by Manutius to Dudithius, the name of the latter is suppressed; but that in Krause's edition, published at Leipzig in 1720, 8vo., the name of Dudithius has been restored from the most ancient editions. On this subject the reader will find much valuable information in the Appendix to the present work,* communicated to the author by one whom he is proud to call his friend,—Richard Taylor, Esq., F.L.S., F.G.S.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 61—64. *Moreri* Dict. Hist. Art. DUDITH. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 252—322. *Smaleii* Diarium, apud Zeltm. Hist. Crypto-Soc. pp. 1166. 1174. 1196. *Socini* Opera, T. I. pp. 495—534. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. ii. Sect. 2, pp. 47—50. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 99. *Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 214. *Moshem*. Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § ix. *Schellhornii* Amoen. Literar. T. V. pp. 254, 255. *Lampe*, Hist. Eccles. Ref. in Hungaria et Transylvania, A.D. 1565, pp. 124, 125. Mon. Rep. Vol. V. (1810) pp. 651, 652. *Thomæ Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. ii. C. iv. § x. pp. 138—154, et Ref.

89.

JOHN KROTOVIUS, (*Polon.* GROTKOWSKI,) was the first Minister of the Church of Smigel, over which, according to the Manuscript Acts of Synod, he presided in the year 1580. It is stated in these Acts, that he judaized; and that he never taught the people from the books of the New Testament, but only from those of the Old; and never himself invoked the Son of God, or permitted the people to invoke him. The Synod of Racow, held on the 10th of

* APPENDIX, No. xxiv.

May, 1580, endeavoured to convince him that he was in error on these subjects ; but for a long time he would not listen, or pay any attention to what was said, and being a man of no common attainments, he defended his views with much ability. At length, however, he was prevailed upon, by the arguments and importunities of his friends, to give way ; and Bock says, that, both by tears and in words, he retracted the error which he had been instrumental in disseminating, and joined the rest of the Unitarian community. In the year 1584, he was appointed Minister of the Church at Kieidany, in the Grand Dukedom of Lithuania. He was probably the father of John Grotkovius, who married the daughter of Valentine Smalcus. (*Vide Art.* 187.)

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 425, 426.

90.

FAUSTUS SOCINUS, (*Ital.* SOZINI or SOZZINI,) was descended, in a direct line, from the eminent Lawyer, Mari-anus Socinus ; and was related to many persons of illustrious rank, and distinguished learning. His father was Alexander Socinus, also an eminent Lawyer, who was honoured with a diploma by the University of Sienna, in the year 1530, conferring on him the degree of Doctor of the Civil and Canon Law ; and was soon after appointed Professor in Ordinary in the University of Padua. His mother was Agnes, daughter of Burgesius Petrucci, Chief of the Republic of Sienna, and Victoria Piccolomini, niece to Pope Pius II., a lady of singular virtue and worth, who instilled into her daughter's mind the purest and noblest sentiments. As far, therefore, as regards his descent, he could boast of being sprung from the first patrician families of Sienna ; and of being connected, through them, with the noblest houses of Italy.

Faustus was much attached to all the members of his own family; but his favourite uncle was Lælius. (Vide *Art.* 13.) Of his female relations, next to his grandmother, Camilla, he evinced the strongest partiality for his aunt Portia, wife of Lælius Beccius, and his sister Phyllis, wife of Cornelius Marsilius.

He was born at Sienna, Dec. 5th, 1539. His father died April 26th, 1541, regretted by all Italy; and Faustus being thus deprived in early childhood of that paternal superintendence, which is of so much importance in a boy's education, and left entirely to the charge of a fond and indulgent mother, the instruction which he received was of a more general and superficial kind, than it would probably have been, had his father's life been spared. He merely passed through the usual course of polite literature; and it was ever afterwards matter of painful recollection to him, that his education had been so scanty, and that he had not enjoyed the assistance of a tutor. He acknowledged, in a letter to a friend, that he had never studied Philosophy; that he was a stranger to the Divinity of the Schools; and that his acquaintance with Logic was confined to the mere rudiments of that science, a knowledge of which he had gained late in life, and after most of his controversial works were written. It was a reproach to that proud age, says his biographer, to be taught, by so remarkable an example, that there may be great men, and men capable of accomplishing great things, without those aids, to which we properly attach a high value, but which we are too apt to estimate beyond their real worth. Perhaps, too, he adds, it was expedient, that a man of genius, who was born to effect a revolution in the opinions of the world, should be tainted with no prejudices, lest any fibre of those errors, which it was his mission to eradicate, should take root in his own mind.

The first part of his life, till he had attained the age of twenty-three, was employed in procuring the small stock of learning already alluded to, and in studying the Civil Law. But he had, in the mean time, through the innate strength of his own genius, and the instructions of his uncle Lælius, imbibed some principles of religious knowledge, and gained an insight into the prevailing errors of the day. The letters which Lælius had from time to time written to his relations in Italy, and which were the means of infusing into their minds many of his own favourite opinions, had also made an impression upon his nephew, Faustus, in the strength of whose mental powers he had great confidence; and to whom he looked forward, as the medium, through which his own views would be ultimately laid open to the world. It nevertheless appears, that Lælius, in some degree, maintained the same kind of reserve towards Faustus, as he did towards his Protestant friends in Switzerland and Germany; and that the questions, on which he declined to satisfy the curiosity of his nephew, were more numerous than those, on which he gave him the benefit of his instructions. The cause of this apparent reserve probably was a fear, lest his correspondence with his nephew, and other friends in Italy, should be intercepted; and his plans for the extension of his views among his countrymen prematurely disclosed, and rendered abortive. Nor, as the event shewed, was such a feeling altogether groundless; for by some means, not clearly indicated, and probably never distinctly ascertained, the whole family of the Socini became involved in a suspicion of heresy.

After the death of Alexander Socinus, Lælius had three brothers still living. Celsus was settled at Bologna; but Cornelius and Camillus resided at Sienna, with their nephew, Faustus. (*Vide Art.* 14—16.) Lælius had made converts of these, together with some of their wives; nor

were there wanting others among his friends in Italy, who were either parties to his plans of religious reformation, or privy to them. But suspicion having been excited, Cornelius was apprehended, and thrown into prison; and the rest were either intimidated, or put to flight. The same cause drove Faustus, then a very young man, from his native country, and led him to seek refuge in France.

In the year 1562, while he was residing at Lyons, he heard of the unexpected death of his uncle Lælius at Zurich, and immediately repaired thither, to take possession of his uncle's manuscripts;—an object, in the attainment of which he was materially assisted by Marius Besozzus. After an absence of about three years, which he spent chiefly in Switzerland, he returned to Italy; and having formed an acquaintance with the Grand Duke of Tuscany, he lived twelve years in his Court, discharged the most honourable duties there, and was eminently distinguished by the favour of that Prince, and the dignities conferred upon him. At the end of this term, he entered into a serious consideration of the value of the different objects that solicit the attention of men; and into sober reflections on the true end, and highest happiness of human life. The result of these reflections was a firm conviction, that the greatest earthly prospects dwindle into insignificance, in comparison with the hope of heavenly glory and felicity. He voluntarily left his country, his friends, his hopes, and his wealth, that he might be the more disengaged, to seek his own salvation, and that of others. Nor were his services lightly estimated by the Grand Duke; for his departure excited the profound regret of that Prince, and repeated, but unavailing attempts were made, at the instance of Paolo Giordano Orsini, a Nobleman who had married the Grand Duke's sister, to prevail upon him to return.

It was in the year of our Lord 1574, and the thirty-fifth of his own age, that he left Italy. He was hospitably received at Basle, where he remained upwards of three years, for the purpose of adding to his stock of theological knowledge, being chiefly intent upon gaining a thorough acquaintance with the sacred writings, to the study of which he devoted himself in an earnest and serious spirit; and he was greatly assisted in his inquiries by a few papers, and a number of scattered notes, which his uncle had left behind him. Of the use to which he applied these he made no secret, although he might have taken to himself the whole credit of them, had he been so disposed.

He remained at Basle till the year 1577, when he began to throw off all reserve and disguise, as to his religious opinions; for, regarding them as the truths of God, he thought it a crime to conceal them in his own breast. Acting on this principle, and desirous of diffusing around him the light, which had been, in his apprehension, poured in upon his own mind, he insensibly proceeded, from holding free conversations with his friends on religious subjects, to debates with others. He entered into a dispute concerning the Office of Jesus Christ, as our Saviour;—first a verbal, and afterwards a written one. Before this was finished, a regard to his health obliged him to desist from his studies, and seek repose in the neighbouring city of Zurich; and being debarred from the use of his papers, which he had left behind him at Basle, he held another dispute with Francis Pucci, at Zurich, in the beginning of the year 1578. In the same year he returned to Basle, and put the last hand to his book “*De Servatore.*”

About the same time, the opinion of Francis Davidis and some others, relative to the honour and power of Christ, produced great disturbances and commotions in the Anti-trinitarian Churches in Transylvania. With a view to

provide a remedy for this evil, Blandrata, who had great influence with the members of those Churches, and with the Bathorean Princes, who then possessed the supreme authority in the state, invited Faustus from Basle in the same year, that he might draw off Francis Davidis, the head of the party, from his peculiar sentiments. The more conveniently to effect this object, Blandrata, at his own expense, paid for the board of Faustus in the house of Davidis, that they might enjoy the advantage of the same place of residence, and the same table, which they did for between four and five months. But the attempt was followed by no good result; for Davidis, neither satisfied, nor induced, by the arguments of Socinus, to abandon the position which he had taken, not only retained his opinions, and privately propagated them, but publicly advanced them from the pulpit; for which he was thrown into prison, by order of the Prince of Transylvania, where, after a short time, he died in a state of delirium.

The part, which Faustus took in this affair, has been considered, by many, the greatest blot upon his character. The charges usually brought against him, in reference to the persecution of Francis Davidis, resolve themselves into the three following. First, that he was the instigator of the proceedings: Secondly, that, by an abuse of confidence and hospitality, he furnished the materials, on which the prosecution was founded: and Thirdly, that he assisted personally in the arrangement and direction of it. To these charges Dr. T. Rees has furnished as many distinct replies, in a valuable contribution to the "Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature," of which replies the following extracts contain the substance.

1. "No attempt has ever been made, as far as now appears, to substantiate the first charge by evidence.—This charge is, moreover, sufficiently invalidated by the state-

ment, which the enemies of Socinus have themselves given, of the origin of the rupture between Blandrata and Davidis, and of the unrelenting hostility with which the former acted towards the latter in all the subsequent transactions. The following testimony may be taken from the pen of Blandrata himself. After Socinus had reported to him the unsuccessful termination of his disputations with Davidis, Blandrata writes to him :—‘Tell Francis that thus far I have not declared myself his enemy to the Prince, but henceforth he may regard me as such.’ (Bod, *Historia Unitariorum in Transylvania*. Lugd. 1781, p. 110.) A few days subsequently were issued to the Senate of Coloswar, the orders of the Prince for the deposition and arrest of the Superintendent.” This reply to the first charge is perfectly conclusive.

2. “Agreeably to the original arrangement, made with the concurrence of Davidis himself, Socinus transmitted to Blandrata, from time to time, the written arguments which were drawn up in the course of the disputations: and had these documents been employed as the ground-work of the charges to be exhibited against Davidis before the Synod, no blame could have attached to Socinus for making the communications. But Blandrata did not at all avail himself of these papers.” This statement appears to require some qualification. It is quite true, that no blame attaches to Socinus for making the communications, because this was done in conformity with the original arrangement, made with Davidis’s own concurrence; but it is also true, that, in the letter, by which Blandrata convoked the members of the Synod, and which was dated Clausenburg, April 7th, 1579, rather more than a fortnight before the Synod was to meet, he expressly calls attention to the “Theses,” which were to form the grounds of accusation against Francis Davidis. The name of Socinus, however,

nowhere appears in this document. Blandrata takes upon himself the whole responsibility; and though the "Antitheses" are known to have been "written by Faustus Socinus," (Socini Opera, T. II. p. 801,) they are exhibited, in the forementioned document, as the "Antitheses of George Blandrata." (Lampe, Hist. Eccles. Reformat. in Hungaria et Transylvania, p. 306.) The remarks which follow are a sufficient reply to the remainder of the second charge. "The main charge actually preferred against Davidis at his trial was, that on the first Sunday after the termination of his conferences with Socinus, he had publicly declared, in preaching to the people, 'that Christ ought not to be invoked in prayer; and that those who prayed to him, sinned as much as if they prayed to the Virgin Mary, or Peter, or Paul, or any other dead saints.' It is not pretended that this accusation was made by Socinus; nor is there any evidence of his being among the auditors of Davidis, when the words are alleged to have been uttered. The officer of the Court, when he read the charge, expressly stated, that the information had been communicated to the Prince, by the brethren, the disciples and associates of Davidis, who were then present among his accusers, that is to say, by other Ministers of Coloswar, who had on this occasion joined themselves to Blandrata. There is, therefore, no evidence to criminate Socinus."

3. "Socinus admits that it was one time his intention to have been present at the Synod convened for the settlement of this controversy, having received the commands of the Prince to attend. He also states that he had, in consequence of this, drawn up his answers to Davidis's arguments, with the view of having them ready to produce, in case the assembly should wish to be made acquainted with them. It is, however, to be observed, that Socinus seems to have thought that the business of the Synod would be

to discuss, as theologians, the controversy which had been agitated between Davidis and himself, and not, as afterwards proved to be its design, to sit in judgment on the worthy Superintendent, for the promulgation of alleged blasphemies against God and Christ. It ought not, therefore, to be suspected that he prepared this document with the view of involving his opponent in any heavier calamity than a removal from his ministerial charge, in order to disable him from the farther dissemination of his opinions.—Socinus concludes his reply to the accusation and calumnies that had been published against him, with the following solemn asseveration, which there is no adequate reason to disbelieve:—‘I neither consented to any more severe measure against Francis, nor knew of any other design of Blandrata and the brethren in this transaction, nor ever said that I knew of any, than that Blandrata himself would take care that the Prince should command Francis to be suspended from his ministerial office, until a general Synod should, as had been agreed upon, put an end to this controversy concerning the invocation of Christ. To this I call God to witness.’” (Socini Opera, Tom. II. p. 712.)

When the conference with Davidis was ended, and the result laid before the Transylvanian Churches, Faustus did not protract his stay, but immediately repaired to Poland, in the hope of escaping a disease, which was then prevalent in Transylvania. He was at this time in his fortieth year; and as he had resolved that Poland should in future be his adopted country, he felt desirous of being admitted as a member of those Churches, which acknowledged the Father only to be the Supreme God. Not agreeing with them, however, upon some minor points, he met with a refusal; but bore the disappointment with equanimity, and repelled, with vigour and success, the attacks made upon him by his opponents. By his frequent disputations and writings, in

defence of what he deemed the cause of God and of Truth, he exasperated many, some of whom accused him to the King, and said that it would be a reflection upon his government to suffer the author of these writings, whom they invidiously styled an *Italian* vagrant and exile, to go unpunished. Upon this Faustus left Cracow, where he had resided about four years, and retired to the seat of Christopher Morstinus, a Polish Nobleman, and Lord of Paulikovice, where his innocence was protected, not by secrecy, but by the privilege of the Nobility of Poland; for at that time the Polish Nobles possessed almost an independent jurisdiction, and exercised nearly an absolute authority in their own districts. This country-seat was only a few miles from Cracow; a situation which promised to afford him much greater facilities for his own vindication, than a prison, to which he might have been consigned, had he remained much longer in that city.

This benevolent Nobleman not only opened his hospitable doors, for the entertainment of Faustus, in that season of danger, but supported him for more than three years. He loaded this exile and foreigner, indeed, with still greater and more substantial tokens of kindness and respect, giving him his daughter in marriage, by which he became connected with the first families in Poland. The issue of this alliance was an only daughter, named Agnes, who was born about Whitsuntide, 1587. His marriage into so respectable a family contributed greatly to spread his opinions among the higher classes; and prepared the way for that powerful influence, which, after having been for some years repulsed by the Antitrinitarian Churches, he finally gained over them. But in the midst of his success, as a religious reformer, he was destined to encounter domestic trials of no ordinary kind.

About three or four months after the birth of his daugh-

ter, he lost his wife; and this calamity was followed by a dangerous attack of illness, which was of so unyielding a nature, as to interrupt his studies for a considerable time. Nor was this all; for, by the death of Francis, Grand Duke of Tuscany, he was deprived of the revenues arising out of his estates in Italy, which had before been regularly transmitted to him, as they became due. At one time, indeed, his Italian property had been in some danger, and intrigues, to which even the Pope was a consenting party, had been set on foot to deprive him of it; but by the mediation of Isabella Medici, sister of the Grand Duke, during her life, and afterwards by the kindness of her brother, as long as he survived, Faustus had his rents annually remitted. On the death of these Princes, everything conspired to distress him. Yet he bore his sufferings with meekness and patience; and having returned to Cracow, sought some consolation, under his personal and domestic afflictions, and amidst the licentiousness and turbulence of the times, in striving to purge away the errors, which then prevailed throughout the Christian world; an employment, to which many beside himself thought that he had been called, by the special Providence of God.

He had all along frequented the ecclesiastical assemblies, and for some time taken a leading part in them. At the Synod of Wengrow, in 1584, he maintained the doctrine of the worship of Jesus Christ; and contended, that its rejection would lead to Judaism, and even to Atheism. At the same Synod, and at that of Chmielnik, held in the same year, he powerfully contributed to the rejection of the Millenarian opinions, taught by many of the Antitrinitarians. It was at the desire of this last-named Synod, that he wrote his reply to the attacks of the Jesuits of Posnania. His influence was completely established at the Synod of Brest, in Lithuania, in 1588, where he removed all

the differences that divided the Antitrinitarians of Poland, and gave unity to their Churches, by moulding their previously undefined and discordant opinions into one complete and harmonious religious system. At this Synod, he disputed with unusual vigour and success, concerning the Death and Sacrifice of Christ, Justification, and the Corruption of Human Nature; and opposed the adherents of Francis Davidis and Simon Budnæus, on the subject of the Invocation of Jesus Christ.

It was during the same year, that the care of the Church at Luclavice was entrusted to Peter Statorius the younger, (*vide Art. 128.*) son of Peter Statorius of Thionville, whose family had formerly been naturalized, and obtained the privileges of Nobility in the kingdom of Poland. Being no less distinguished by the quickness of his judgment, than by his eloquence, this celebrated man, when once admitted to the friendship of Faustus, entered fully into his views, and became the willing advocate of his opinions. Some time before this also, Faustus had drawn over not a few of the leading men among the Unitarians to his own sentiments; and the number of his adherents daily increased. Still, however, some persons of great influence stood aloof, as Niemojevius, Czechovicius, and the majority of the older Ministers. John Securinus is said to have been the first, who dared openly to defend the opinions of Socinus. (*Vide Art. 53.*) Others shortly followed; among whom, the three brothers, Andrew, Stanislaus and Christopher Lubieniecus, contributed greatly to strengthen the Socinian party. (*Vide Art. 121—123.*) These were men of illustrious descent, and splendid promise; and having been brought up as courtiers, and accustomed to the society of Kings, Princes, and the higher class of Nobles, afforded the best evidence of true greatness of character, by exchanging the allurements of a Court for

the study and practice of religion. Others who bore the office of Pastors, and particularly the younger ones, whose prejudices were fewer and less inveterate than those of the senior Ministers, continued to swell the number of Faustus's admirers; and what rendered these accessions the more valuable was, that, amidst the great variety of opinions which prevailed, all seemed desirous of contending for the truth, rather than the victory. Their discussions were conducted with earnestness, but their zeal was tempered with candour and discretion; and it was in this beautiful and truth-seeking spirit, that the business of their Synods was transacted. Two remarkable examples of this have been recorded, in the accounts of John Niemojevius and Nicholas Zytynius, which, if they should have escaped the notice, or recollection of the reader, he will find, by turning back to *Articles* 60 and 70.

Nor were the Polish Unitarians less distinguished by their candour and good temper, when disputing among themselves, than when encountering the arguments of their opponents. No one, who has once read, can ever forget, the remarkable encomium of Archbishop Tillotson, upon the followers of Socinus, as a religious body, in the second of his Sermons "Concerning the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour." After pointing out a solitary exception to this rule, in the case of Schlichtingius, of whom he nevertheless says, "that it is not usual with him to fall into such rash and rude expressions," he thus continues. "To do right to the writers on that side, I must own, that generally they are a pattern of the fair way of disputing, and of debating matters of religion without heat and unseemly reflections upon their adversaries, in the number of whom I did not expect that the Primitive Fathers of the Christian Church would have been reckoned by them. They generally argue matters with that temper and gravity, and with that free-

dom from passion and transport which becomes a serious and weighty argument: and for the most part they reason closely and clearly, with extraordinary guard and caution, with great dexterity and decency, and yet with smartness and subtilty enough; with a very gentle heat, and few hard words; virtues to be praised wherever they are found, yea even in an enemy, and very worthy of our imitation. In a word, they are the strongest managers of a weak cause, and which is ill-founded at the bottom, that perhaps ever meddled with controversy: insomuch that some of the Protestants, and the generality of the Popish writers, and even the Jesuits themselves, who pretend to all the reason and subtilty in the world, are in comparison of them but mere scolds and bunglers. Upon the whole matter, they have but this one great defect, that they want a good cause, and truth on their side; which if they had, they have reason, and wit, and temper enough to defend it."

The *petitio principii* towards the close of this passage, as to the want of a good cause, may well be excused in a writer, who, notwithstanding the liberal tendencies of his own mind, well knew the value of a reputation for orthodoxy. Nor does this assumption, however honestly made, derogate, in any degree, from the strength of the encomium itself; but tends rather to enhance, and confirm it. No one can deny, (for it is indisputable,) that the able men, whom Faustus Socinus gathered around him, and enlisted under his banners, were remarkably distinguished for the qualities attributed to them by the worthy Archbishop.

But the individual, to whose eloquence Faustus was most indebted, for the ascendancy which he acquired over the Antitrinitarian Churches of Poland, was Peter Statorius the younger. That accomplished orator set forth, in an engaging and popular form, those parts of the Socinian

system, which had before been considered beyond the reach of ordinary understandings. Him, therefore, Faustus employed as the chief interpreter of his mind; and the advantages resulting from his coöperation soon became conspicuous, in the flourishing state of the Polish Unitarian Church.

Faustus, however, besides being exposed to various petty annoyances from his Protestant adversaries, had become particularly obnoxious to the Catholic inhabitants of Cracow. While he resided there, the calamities, which generally attend those who faithfully adhere to the dictates of conscience, threatened him from every quarter; but especially was the enmity of many revived and heightened, after he published his book "*De Servatore.*" In the year 1598, when he was ill, and confined to his chamber for the recovery of his health, the rabble, instigated by the students of the University, dragged him from his bed half naked, and with great indignities forced him through the streets and market-place, with the intention of murdering him. But he was at length rescued from their fury by the interposition of two of the Professors, assisted by the Rector of the University, who succeeded in saving their most formidable polemical antagonist, by deceiving the infuriated multitude, and exposing themselves to no small personal danger. On this occasion, Faustus was plundered of his library, with all its furniture, which was destroyed by the mob; but he regarded the loss of his goods as nothing, in comparison with that of his manuscripts, of which he particularly regretted a treatise, composed against the Atheists. He was often heard to declare, in reference to this event, that he would gladly recover his papers at the expense of his life.

When threats were added to the barbarous treatment which he received from the populace, he retired a second

time from Cracow, and found an asylum at Luclavice, a village which lay about nine Polish miles from that city, and which was afterwards rendered famous by his abode and death. There he became an inmate in the house of Abraham Blonski, the proprietor of the place, with whom he continued to reside, during the rest of his life. There, too, an Antitrinitarian Church had existed for some time, of which his friend, Peter Statorius, was the Minister. Living, therefore, as neighbours, assembling as fellow-worshippers, and affording each other mutual aid in the great work in which they were engaged, they succeeded, by their combined efforts, in extending and consolidating the foundations of the infant Church. Even Niemojevius at length gave in his adhesion to Socinus in most things; and with a degree of ingenuousness, in complete keeping with the rest of his character, acknowledged and retracted the errors, into which he had been inadvertently led. Czechovicius remained the only dissentient. But he too, finding himself deserted and alone, connived at changes, which it was beyond his power to prevent. He made an effort, indeed, to revive the controversy about Baptism; but, by the advice of Faustus, the subject was allowed to rest, and in the course of time died a natural death.

Czechovicius differed from Faustus, rather on the perpetuity of Baptism, than on the mode of its administration. He contended that Baptism by immersion was necessary, in the case of all adult believers;—as well of those who were born of Christian parents, as of those who were converted from a faith altogether different from the Christian. (Vide *Art.* 61.) Socinus, too, regarded the practice of Infant Baptism as a great and hurtful error, particularly on account of the stress laid upon it by the Catholics, and the followers of Calvin. (*Opera*, T. I. p. 702.) But he thought, at the same time, that Baptism ought not to be

regarded as a perpetual ordinance of the Church; and that it was not prescribed for those, who, in any way, had given their names to Christ, or from their earliest years had been educated and instructed in the Christian discipline. He was also of opinion, that, if Baptism is to be retained at all in modern times, it is to be retained principally on account of those, who are converted from other religions to the Christian. "I do not see," says he, "why such may not be baptized by those, who have preached Christ to them: or, if they have no spiritual father in Christ among men, why he may not perform this service, who has been fixed upon for the office by the congregation to which they are willing to join themselves; since the Baptism of water, administered in the name of Jesus Christ, is only the shadowing forth of the forgiveness of sins in the name of Christ, in open profession of his name, and a kind of initiation into his religion. Nothing is really communicated by it; but it is a recognition of what has been granted, and will most certainly be bestowed." (*Opera*, T. I. pp. 350, 351.) Entertaining these views, Socinus did all in his power to allay the animosities, which had arisen out of the controversy on the subject of Baptism; and it would appear, that, as long as he lived, "Baptism was not considered by the Polish Churches as a Christian institution of perpetual obligation." (*Rees's Racovian Catechism*, p. 249, Note d.)

Having thus succeeded in removing the principal causes of contention, and bringing all into a state of harmony, as if his life had been protracted only to accomplish this purpose, on the 3rd of March, 1604, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, he was taken away at Luclavice, by a death, not so immature to himself, as mournful to his friends. His last words were, "That not less satiated with life, than with the enmity and calamities which he had felt, he was

expecting, with joyful and undaunted hope, that last moment, which would bring with it a release from his trials, and the recompence of his labours."

Peter Statorius, his beloved companion and associate, delivered the funeral address over his remains; and, in the course of the next year, having accomplished his own allotted task on earth, followed him to the grave, at the early age of forty.

The epitaph, said to have been inscribed on the tomb of Faustus Socinus, shews what his friends thought of the extent and value of his labours. In two lines, by alluding to Popery under the similitude of a building, the author pays him the highest possible compliment.

Tota ruet Babylon : destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Muros Calvinus, sed fundamenta Socinus.

"It must be granted," says Robinson, "there is a strict adherence to truth in this epitaph, though the glory is not due to Socinus first, nor to him alone." (*Eccles. Res. p. 620.*) To him, however, is preëminently due the glory of having effected that, which none of his predecessors in the same path had been able to accomplish. "Under the auspicious protection of such a spirited and insinuating chief," says Mosheim, "the little flock, that had hitherto been destitute of strength, resolution and courage, grew apace, and, all of a sudden, arose to a high degree of credit and influence. Its number was augmented by proselytes of all ranks and orders. Of these some were distinguished by their nobility, others by their opulence, others by their address, and many by their learning and eloquence. All these contributed, in one way or another, to increase the lustre, and to advance the interests of this rising community; and to support it against the multitude of adversaries, which its remarkable prosperity and success had raised up against it from all quarters : the rich maintained

it by their liberality, the powerful by their patronage and protection, and the learned by their writings." Before the time of Faustus Socinus, the Antitrinitarians of Poland had been distinguished by the names of *Pinczovians* and *Racovians*, from Pinczow, where they had their earliest settlement, and Racow, which for several years formed their metropolis; and different sections among them had been called *Farnovians* and *Budnæans*, from Stanislaus Farnovius, and Simon Budnæus, their respective leaders. (Vide Art. 62 and 76.) But these, and all other distinctive epithets, applied to them by the orthodox, such as *Arians*, *Ebionites*, *Photinians* and *Servetians*, were ultimately absorbed, in the general denomination of SOCINIANS, as including, and comprehending all the rest; and although the Socinians, as a body, have long since become extinct, the name still survives, and is a favourite epithet, in the mouths of bigots and persecutors of every creed, for the advocates of a liberal and enlightened theology. Does any one throw off the yoke of priestly authority, and assert the liberty with which Christ has made him free? He is a Socinian. Does he venture to express a modest and trembling doubt, concerning the fallacy of the creed, which assumes to itself the name of orthodox? He is tainted with the pernicious opinions of that arch-heretic Socinus. Does he cling to his Bible, as the only rule of faith and practice? He is a true disciple of the Socinian school. Perhaps the best reply, which any one can give, who falls under this ban, is that which was given by William Penn, when, in consequence of the liberal opinions advanced by him in his "Sandy Foundation shaken," he was charged with being a Socinian. "I must confess," says he, in the defence of himself, which he published, under the title of "Innocency with her open Face,"—"I have heard of one Socinus, of (that they call) a noble family in Siene in Italy,

who about the year 1574, *being a young man*, voluntarily did abandon the glories, pleasures and honours of the Great Duke of Tuscany's Court at Florence, (that noted place for all worldly delicacies,) and became a perpetual exile for his conscience; whose parts, wisdom, gravity, and just behaviour made him the most famous with the Polonian and Transylvanian Churches; *but I was never baptized into his name*, and therefore deny that reproachful epithet; and if in anything I acknowledge the verity of his doctrine, it is *for the truth's sake*, of which, in many things, he had a clearer prospect than most of his contemporaries."

Beneath the portrait of Faustus Socinus, prefixed to his Works in the "Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum," are the following panegyrical lines.

Adspice, spectator, quæ gesserit ora Socinus.

Illa tibi vere parva tabella dabit.

Ingenii dotes, quas non solertia possit

Pandere pingendo, grande volumen habet.

È tenebris dudum latitantia sphalmata traxit.

Tracta repellebat lumine cuncta Dei.

For an outline of the Religious System of the Polish Socinians, the reader is referred to the account of Valentine Smalcus (*Art.* 153); and for a description of their Ecclesiastical Organization, to that of Peter Morscovius (*Art.* 238).

The writings of Faustus Socinus were published collectively in the "Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum," Fol., of which they form the first two volumes, bearing date, "Irenopoli, post Annum Domini 1656." Some of them had been previously published. Others then saw the light for the first time. The first Volume contains his *Exegetical* and *Didactic*, and the second his *Polemical* writings. They are arranged in the following order.

Vol. I.—1. An Exposition of the Fifth, and Part of

the Sixth Chapter of Matthew's Gospel (Fol. 1—74). This was a posthumous, and an unfinished work; and was first published at Racow, in 1618, 8vo. It was intended to include the whole of the Sermon on the Mount; but does not in fact extend beyond Matt. vi. 21.

2. An Exposition of the Proëm of John's Gospel, (Fol. 75—86,) composed about the year 1562, and ascribed by Zanchius, Beza, and some Polish writers, through mistake, to Lælius Socinus. Some time after its publication, it was translated into the Polish language. An edition of it was published in 8vo. at Racow, in 1618; and a Dutch version of it appeared in 1664.

3. A Disputation with John Niemojevius concerning the Seventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (Fol. 87—114): first printed at Cracow in 1584, 8vo., under the feigned name of *Prosper Dysideus*, and again, with the author's own name, at Racow, 1612, 8vo. The question on which the Disputation turns is, Whether the Apostle speaks in his own person, as one renewed by the Spirit of Christ, or not? An Abridgment of this work was published in 1591, 4to., under the title, "*De Peccato et Peccatorum Remissione: item Scopus septimi Capituli ad Romanos.*"

4. A Defence of the preceding Disputation against the Strictures of N. N., a so-called Evangelical Minister (Fol. 116—138): first published at Racow in 1595, and again in 1618, 8vo. A Dutch version of it appeared in 1661, 8vo., to which was added, A Compendium of the Christian Religion.

5. An Explanation of various Passages of Scripture (Fol. 139—154): first published, with an Address to the Reader by Jerome Moscorovius, in 1614, 8vo.; and reprinted in 1618, with the Exposition of the Proëm of John's Gospel. Vide No. 2.

6. A Commentary on the First Epistle of John (Fol. 155—264): first published, by Valentine Smalcus, at Racow, in 1614, 8vo., with a Dedication to the Senators of Strasburg. It was written down, from the author's dictation, about a year before his death, for the use of a German Nobleman, who had come from Paris to Poland in search of Christian truth, and for the benefit of other theological inquirers. The author regards Ch. v. 7, as spurious; and therefore thinks it unnecessary to enter into any explanation of it.

7. On the Authority of the Holy Scripture (Fol. 265—280); to which is added a Summary of the Christian Religion (Fol. 281): likewise, an Explanation of the principal, or at least the most common Argument in Favour of the Trinity, (Fol. 281—284,) and Theses intended to shew, that Christ is not possessed of true Divinity, unless he be the Creator of Heaven and Earth; together with Answers (Fol. 285). The treatise "On the Authority of Scripture," which has been reckoned, by the orthodox, one of the author's best productions, was originally written in Italian, about the year 1570, for the use of a person of rank. Faustus afterwards translated it into Latin; and in 1588, a 12mo. edition of it was published at Seville, by Lazarus Ferrerius, in which the authorship was ascribed to R. P. Dominic. Lopez, of the Society of Jesus, who claimed the work as his own, but betrayed himself, by praising certain opinions in the Preface, which were at variance with those contained in the body of the book. A French version of it, by Nicholas Bernaud, a gentleman of Dauphiny, was published at Basle, in 1592, to which were prefixed some remarks by the Divines of that city; and the Latin was reprinted at Racow, in 1611, 8vo. In the same year Conrad Vorstius published an edition of it at Steinfurt, with a Preface. This is reckoned the best edition. A Dutch

translation of it, with Notes, was published, in 1622, by Theodore Raphaels Camphuysius; of which reprints appeared at Racow, in 1623 and 1664, 4to. The latter contained Vorstius's Preface. Dr. Smallbrooke, Bishop of St. David's, says, that Grotius, in the composition of his book, "*De Veritate Christianæ Religionis*," was indebted, in an especial manner, to the valuable performance of a writer, otherwise justly of ill fame, meaning Faustus Socinus, with a reference to whose work, "*De Autoritate S. Scripturæ*," this ungracious acknowledgment is made. An English translation from the Steinfurt edition was published by the Rev. E. Coombe, a Clergyman of the Church of England, in the year 1731, under the title of "*An Argument for the Authority of the Holy Scripture, from the Latin of Socinus*."

8. Sacred Lectures (Fol. 287—322). In this, which is an unfinished work, the authority of the Scriptures is ably vindicated. It was not written by the pen of Faustus, but dictated to an amanuensis, and never afterwards revised; but it bears strong marks of the author's critical skill, and of the extent and accuracy of his biblical knowledge. It was first printed at Racow, in 1618, 8vo., with a short Preface, supposed to have been written by Jerome Moscorovius. A Dutch version of it, with Notes, by Theod. Raph. Camphuysius, appeared in 1666, 4to.

9. Various Tracts concerning the Church (Fol. 323—358): first published at Racow, in 1611, 8vo. These tracts are on the following subjects. *First*, That the Catholics cannot defend their Doctrines and Rites by the Authority of the Church; and that it is unnecessary to discuss, What constitutes the Church, or among whom it exists? (Fol. 323—325). *Secondly*, A brief Demonstration of the Unreasonableness of Disputes about the Ministry among so-called Evangelical Ministers (Fol. 325, 326). *Thirdly*,

Scruples proposed by an excellent Man concerning the Church. *Fourthly*, F. S.'s Reply to these Scruples (Fol. 326—333). *Fifthly*, An Explanation of the Words of Christ, "Thou art Peter, and on this Rock," &c., Matt. xvi. 18 (Fol. 334—341). *Sixthly*, Extracts from the Writings of F. S. concerning the Church (Fol. 341—343). *Seventhly*, Against those who do not diligently inquire for themselves into Subjects relating to their eternal Salvation (Fol. 343, 344). *Eighthly*, Observations concerning the Church, and the Invocation of Christ, taken from the Letters of F. S. (Fol. 345—358). Of these eight tracts a Dutch version was printed in 1639, 4to.

10. Letters of F. S. to his Friends, in which many Questions relating to Divine Things are discussed, and many Passages of Scripture are explained; to which are added a few Letters of others addressed to F. S., with his Replies (Fol. 539—534): first published at Racow in 1618, 8vo., and reprinted, with Additions, in the *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.*

11. Theological Lectures (Fol. 535—600): first published at Racow in 1609, 4to. These Lectures were posthumous, and were edited by Valentine Smalcius, who inscribed them "To the University of Heidelberg." A second edition was published in 1625, and a third in 1627, 4to. They were twice translated into Dutch, and the second time with extensive corrections and additions. The subjects discussed are various; and the number of Chapters is 29.

12. Tracts on Justification (Fol. 601—628). The number of these tracts is six, and their designations are as follow. *First*, Two Synopses, one on Justification by Christ, and the other on Justification before God (Fol. 601—603). *Secondly*, Theses concerning Justification (Fol. 603, 604). *Thirdly*, A Dialogue of N. N. on Justification, with the Notes of F. S. (Fol. 604—618). *Fourthly*, Frag-

ments on Justification (Fol. 619—622). *Fifthly*, On Faith and Works as they relate to our Justification, from a Letter in Italian addressed to N. N. (Fol. 622—626). *Sixthly*, Theses on the Cause and Foundation, in Man himself, of that Faith in God, by which the Scriptures declare that he is justified (Fol. 626, 627). The first Synopsis was published in 1591, 4to., under the fictitious name of Gratianus Turpio Gerapolensis; and again, with the other tracts, at Racow, in 1611, 8vo., and 1616, 4to.

13. Sophistical Arguments explained by F. S. for the Benefit of his Friends, and illustrated by Theological Examples (Fol. 629—650). The friend, for whose more particular benefit the explanation of these Arguments was intended, was Christopher Ostorod. The work, which was posthumous, F. S. dictated, but did not write: nor was it finished, or revised by him. It was first published at Racow, in 1625, 8vo.

14. Brief Instructions in the Christian Religion by way of Question and Answer, in the Catechetical Form; to which is added a Fragment of a former Catechism of F. S., which perished in the Destruction of his Property at Cracow (Fol. 651—690). The first of these was published at Racow in 1618, 8vo. It appears to have been begun in 1593; then laid aside; then resumed in 1603, after an interval of ten years, and revised, with the assistance of Peter Statorius; but after all, left unfinished, in consequence of the death of its author. The second piece was first published in the Bibl. Fratr. Polon.

15. The Duty of those in the Kingdom of Poland, and Grand Duchy of Lithuania, who are called Evangelicals, and are studious of true Piety, to join the Churches of those in the same Countries, who are falsely and unjustly called Arians and Ebionites (Fol. 691—708). This was written in the year 1599, at the request of a person of

distinction, who professed a great regard for its author. It was first published in Polish, in 1600, with an Appendix, concerning the defect of Discipline in the Evangelical Church, and the consequences of that defect, as shewn in the daily decrease in the number of its members. After the author's death, it was printed in Dutch and Latin, in 1610, 8vo.; and extensively circulated in Holland by Ostorod and Voidovius. The Latin was reprinted at Racow, in 1611, 8vo. The first Dutch edition being suppressed, it was again translated from Latin into Dutch, and printed in the Netherlands, in 1630, 4to. The Polish version of 1600 was made by Peter Statorius, Jun.

15. A Disputation on Water Baptism; to which are added Replies to the Notes of Dudithius and Czechovicus (Fol. 709—752). This was written at Cracow in 1580, and printed at Racow in 1613, 8vo. A Dutch translation of it appeared in 1632, both in 8vo. and 4to. The object of it is to shew, that Baptism is not a rite of perpetual obligation; and that it is not binding upon those who are born of Christian parents, or who have already made an open profession of the Christian faith.

17. A brief Treatise on the Lord's Supper, with a Defence of the same against a Writing of John Niemojevius, and some other small Pieces principally relating to the same Subject: to which are added Fragments of two Works of F. S., in the former of which he undertakes to refute the Opinion of those, who affirm that Jesus Christ is the Most High God, or that he existed before his Birth of the Virgin Mary; and in the latter, to reply to the Reasons of those, who attempt to prove that there are three Persons in the one Essence of God (Fol. 753—810). The Treatise on the Lord's Supper was first printed at Racow in 1618, 8vo. The two Fragments appear to have been published for the first time in the *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.*

Among the smaller pieces alluded to are, Themes concerning the Office of Christ; A short Discourse concerning the Method of our Salvation; On the Duty of a Christian Man; On Free-will and Predestination; On the Agreement and Difference of the Old and New Testament; and Strictures on the Theses of Claudius Alberius Triuncuranus concerning the Trinity. To these are added, Some Animadversions of N. N. [or Florian Crusius] upon certain Passages in the Writings of Faustus Socinus, in which Faustus seems to have refuted the Arguments of his Opponents in an unsatisfactory Manner, or to have given erroneous Interpretations of Passages of Scripture; with an Explanation of Is. liii.

18. A Treatise on God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit (Fol. 811—814): first published at Racow in 1611, 8vo. To this are added some Theses, to shew that Christ is not possessed of true Divinity, unless he be the Creator of Heaven and Earth (Fol. 814). These Theses have been already noticed under No. 7.

Vol. II.—1. A Reply for the Racovians to the Book of Palaeologus, entitled, “A Defence of the true Opinion concerning the Civil Magistrate” (Fol. 1—120). According to Przipecovius, the design of this work was not so much to refute the opinion, as to weaken the authority of Palaeologus (vide *Art.* 80); and its composition does the author as little credit, perhaps, as that of any of his writings. It was published anonymously in 1581, 4to., at Cracow; and afterwards, with the author’s name, at Racow in 1627, 8vo.

2. A Disputation concerning Jesus Christ the Saviour, that is, Why and in what Way Jesus Christ is our Saviour, in Reply to James Covet, an Evangelical Minister; shewing that many Things, which, among the Evangelicals, and partly also among others, are deemed Saving Truths of the

Christian Religion, are Pernicious Errors, and exhibiting a clear and copious Explanation of the whole Method of our Salvation by Christ (Fol. 121—246). This Disputation was first published by Elias Arcissevius in 1594, 4to.; but was written almost twenty years before that time. It was reprinted at Franeker, in 1611, with a Reply by Sibrand Lubert; and a Dutch translation of it was published at the same place, in 1654, 4to. Lubert inserted in his Reply the whole of the treatise “De Salvatore,” more to the detriment than the advantage of his own cause, in the opinion of Fabricius, Bayle and others. What follows (Fol. 247—252) is a mere duplicate of Vol. I. Fol. 601, 602. 622—626.

3. A Disputation concerning the State of the First Man before the Fall, held in writing by Faustus Socinus with Francis Pucci in the year 1578, and containing a Reply to Francis Pucci's own Arguments concerning the Immortality of Man, and of All Things before the Fall (Fol. 253—370). This Disputation, which was first published at Racow in 1610, 4to., contains ten arguments of F. Pucci to prove that man was originally created immortal, written at Basle, June 4th, 1577; a reply to these arguments by Socinus; Pucci's defence of his arguments, dated July, 1577; a full refutation of this defence, written at Zurich, January, 1578; and a Dedication of the whole to Prince Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse, by the editor, Jerome Moscorovius.

4. A Disputation on the Nature or Essence of Christ, the Son of God, and also on the Expiation of Sin by him, against Andrew Volanus (Fol. 371—422). The origin of this Disputation was as follows. The Churches of Poland having received a hortatory letter from Andrew Volanus, of Lithuania, in 1579, on the Nature and Expiation of Christ, Faustus Socinus was urged by the Brethren to draw up a reply to it. With this request he complied; but as

he was allowed only a few days for the work, (the messenger who brought the letter from Volanus being obliged to return with the utmost speed,) he called it an extemporaneous reply, and declined affixing his name to it. This was the first work which he composed after he settled in Poland. He revised and corrected it in 1588, and in the same year offered it to the public eye, with a Dedication to John Kiszka, and an answer to all that Volanus had objected. A second edition of the whole was published at Racow in 1627, 8vo.

5. Theological Assertions concerning the Triune God, against the New Samosatensians, extracted from the Lectures of the College of Posnania; together with the Animadversions of Faustus Socinus (Fol. 423—438): also some brief Treatises on different Subjects pertaining to the Christian Religion; viz. 1. An Explanation of Passages alleged to prove the Personality of the Holy Spirit (Fol. 438—444). 2. Extemporaneous Animadversions on a Paper of John Niemojevius against a certain Part of the Disputation concerning Jesus Christ the Saviour (Fol. 444—446). 3. Notes on a Paper of N. N. concerning the Reign of Christ on Earth (Fol. 446—448). 4. Notes on a Paper of Everhard Spangenberg concerning the Two Beasts of the Apocalypse (Fol. 448—453). 5. Reply to Objections, or Articles of John Cutten, an Evangelical Minister (Fol. 453—455). This Reply is repeated, Fol. 463—465. 6. A short Discourse on the Causes of a Belief, or Disbelief of the Gospel; and on the Reason why the Believer is rewarded, and the Unbeliever punished by God (Fol. 455—457). 7. Against the Millennarians concerning Christ's Reign of a thousand Years on Earth (Fol. 457—461). 8. A very short Disputation concerning the Flesh of Christ, against the Mennonites (Fol. 461—463). 9. Two Letters of John Niemojevius on the Sacrifice and

Invocation of Christ, with distinct Replies to each by F. S. (Fol. 465—488). The Reply to the Posnanian Assertions was first published in 1583, 8vo. A second edition was printed by Sebastian Sternacki at Racow in 1611, 8vo.; and a third in 1618, 8vo. The Assertions of the Posnanians, and the Animadversions of F. S., are both twenty-five in number.

6. A Disputation between Erasmus Johannis and Faustus Socinus on the Existence of the only-begotten Son of God (Fol. 489—528): first published at Racow in 1595, 8vo., with a Dedication to Jerome Moscorovius, who had a short time before gone over to the Socinian party. Bock saw a second edition, which was printed at Racow in 1626, and of which Sandius appears to have had no knowledge. The history of this disputation will be given in the account of Erasmus Johannis, who, at the time that it took place, was an Arian Minister, and Pastor of a Church at Clausenburg. (Vide *Art.* 112.)

7. A Reply to a small Polish Treatise of James Wujek, the Jesuit, concerning the Divinity of the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit; together with a Refutation of what the Jesuit, Bellarmin, has written on the same Subject (Fol. 529—624). This Reply was translated from the Latin of F. S. by Peter Statorius, Jun., and published in the Polish language in 1593. It was first published in Latin, with the author's Preface, but without his name, in 1595, 8vo. A second edition in 8vo. issued from the press of Sternacki at Racow in 1624, in the title-page of which the author's name appeared for the first time.

8. A Defence of the Animadversions of F. S. on the Theological Assertions of the College of Posnania, in reply to Gabriel Eutropius, Canon of Posnania (Fol. 625—708): written in the year 1584, but not published till 1618, when Jerome Moscorovius superintended the printing of

it at Racow, in 8vo. This Defence, in the opinion of the editor, exhibits the talent, learning and controversial dexterity of Faustus to more advantage, than any of his writings; and though it was not published till many years after the author's death, he was accustomed to say, in his usual modest manner, whenever it was alluded to, that none of his works gave him so little dissatisfaction as this.

9. A Disputation concerning the Invocation of Jesus Christ, which Faustus Socinus held in Writing with Francis Davidis, in the Years 1578 and 1579, a little before the Death of Francis; containing a Reply to F. D.'s Defence of his Theses concerning the Non-invocation of Christ; with a Dedicatory Epistle of Socinus to the Unitarian Ministers of Transylvania, apologizing for the Delay in the Appearance of this Reply, and repelling the Calumnies long since circulated against him, in a Paper addressed to N. N., under the Name of the Transylvanian Brethren (Fol. 709—766). An imperfect and mutilated edition of this celebrated controversy appeared, in the Hungarian language, as early as the year 1580, in a Defence of Francis Davidis, drawn up by Palæologus and his friends. The most complete account of it was the one published by Socinus himself, in the work, of which the title is given above. It was printed by Valentine Radecius in the year 1595, 8vo., at the expense of John Kiszka. A second edition was published at Racow in 1626, 8vo., which is mentioned by Bock as having been unknown to Sandius.

10. A Disputation held between Faustus Socinus and Christian Francken, on the 14th of March, 1584, on the Honour due to Christ; viz. Whether Christ, as he is not God in the most perfect Sense, is or is not to be regarded as an Object of Religious Worship; with a Correction of the Misstatements of C. F. (Fol. 767—777). The person with whom this Disputation was held had formerly been

a Jesuit at Rome, but having renounced Catholicism, and become an Antitrinitarian, he was appointed to the situation of master of the public school in the town of Chmielnik. It was while he filled this office, that the above Disputation took place. (Vide *Art.* 111.) Francken himself published an account of it, which being full of errors and misrepresentations, Socinus was induced to give his own statement of the matter; but this was not published till 1618, when it issued from the press of Sebastian Sternacki at Racow, in 8vo., with some Notes and Answers to what Francken had advanced. Appended to it were, Fragments of a fuller Answer to Francis Davidis on the Invocation of Christ (Fol. 777—796); Another Fragment of Strictures by F. S. on the Paper of an anonymous Writer concerning the Difference between the Old and New Testament (Fol. 797, 798); Certain Questions of Francis Davidis, and the Answer of Faustus Socinus (Fol. 798, 799); Antitheses from the Disputation between F. S. and F. D., collected by Socinus himself (Fol. 799—801); Theses, in which is explained the Opinion of F. D. concerning the Office of Christ, together with the Antitheses of the Church, written by F. S., and presented to the Most Illustrious Prince of Transylvania, Stephen Bathory (Fol. 801—803); Certain Things to be especially attended to in the Controversy concerning the Invocation of Christ (Fol. 803); On the Book of Revelation, and the Testimonies which it furnishes against those, who wholly object to the Invocation of Jesus Christ (Fol. 803); A Paper of F. S. against the Semi-Judaizers (Fol. 804—806); and Three Letters of Martin Seidelius to the Members of the Lesser Church at Cracow, Worshipers of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Answers of F. S. in the Name of that Church (Fol. 806—812).

Some of the shorter works of Faustus Socinus were

VOL. II. Z

printed twice over, but with slight additions and variations, in the Bibl. Fratr. Polon.; such as the treatise against the Chiliasts, or Millennarians, (T. I. p. 440; II. 457,) the first Synopsis on Justification, &c. (T. I. p. 601; II. 247,) and the Reply to Objections or Articles of John Cutten (T. II. pp. 454. 463).

Sometimes Faustus Socinus lent his assistance, in ushering into the world the works of others; and probably all that he did in this way will never become fully known. It is certain, however, that he edited the “Posthumous Dialogues of Sebastian Castalio, on Predestination, Election, Free-Will and Faith;” and John Licinius’s “Aristotelian Scheme of Doctrines, illustrated with Theological Examples, for the Use of Schools:”—the former in 1578, under the assumed name of “Felix Turpio Urbevetus,” and the latter in 1586, under that of “Gratianus Prosper.” He also published his First Synopsis on Justification, under the feigned name of “Gratianus Turpio Gerapolensis;” and his Disputation on Rom. vii. under that of “Prosper Dysidæus.” Bock thinks, that these names were formed by those, who undertook the publication of his writings. *Prosper*, *Gratianus* and *Felix* seem to have been adopted as synonyms of his Christian name *Faustus*. *Turpio* is evidently derived from *Turpis*, the equivalent of the Italian *Sozzo*, which some suppose to have been the origin of the family surname, *Sozzini*. *Dysidæus*, from the Greek Δυσειδής, denotes the same as *Turpis* or *Deformis*. *Urbevetus* and *Gerapolensis* represent the adjective *Senensis*; *Sen. Vet.* and *Ger.* being respectively the first syllables in the words *Senex*, *Vetus* and Γέρων. For other instances of the imposition and adoption of such names, the reader may consult the account of Michael Gittichius, *Art.* 168.

VIDEND. Vita F. Socini conscripta ab Equite Polono [*Sam. Przyp-
corio*]. *Toulmin’s* Memoirs of the Life, Character, Sentiments and

Writings of F. Socinus. Lond. 1777, 8vo. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 64—81. *Moreri* Dict. Hist. Art. SOCIN. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. SOCIN. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. II. C. iii. § v—x. pp. 654—850. *Thomæ Crenii* Animadv. Philol. et Hist. P. iv. C. ult. pp. 233—242. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 364—378. Mon. Rep. Vol. XIV. (1818) pp. 382—385. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. II. *passim*, etc.

91.

MARCELLUS SQUARCIALUPUS, (*Ital.* SQUARCIALUPO,) was a native of Piombino, and obtained great celebrity by his singular erudition in the studies connected with the medical profession. He was for a time the companion of Blandrata and Faustus Socinus; and was one of the refugees, who, in the sixteenth century, left Italy on account of their religion. He first joined the Reformed Church at Basle; but afterwards went into Transylvania, under the auspices of Blandrata, obtained a pension from the reigning Prince, and avowed himself an Antitrinitarian. Notwithstanding his eminent attainments, he was a man of choleric temper. Of this he gave ample proof in his controversy with Simon Simonius; and in a peevish letter, which he addressed to Faustus Socinus, Sept. 15th, 1581, written in the capital of Transylvania, and printed at the head of that eminent man's correspondence. The object of this letter was to dissuade Socinus from entering into any controversies, but such as were absolutely necessary for the interests of the Church; and to urge upon him the desirableness of being less hasty in publishing what he wrote. He blames Socinus in particular for his book against James Palæologus, which, though published anonymously, was known to be his; and from the strain of his letter, it is evident, that he deprecated the continuance of the dispute concerning the Invocation of Christ. This letter excited the displeasure of Blandrata; and Alciati also complained of the bitter spirit in which it was written. Socinus re-

plied to it, Nov. 20th of the same year; and defended himself at so much length, that Bock says, his answer was more properly a treatise than an epistle. Dr. Toulmin refers to this answer as an evidence of the writer's patience of reproof; and the spirit of it certainly affords an admirable contrast to the querulous tone of Squarcialupus's letter, which gave occasion to it. Little is known of the subsequent part of Squarcialupus's history; and of the time, or circumstances of his death.

Bitter as are the charges, which he brings against Simonius, on account of the fickleness of his opinions, this was a fault, from which he was himself by no means free. At one time he seems to have contemplated a return into the bosom of the Catholic Church; but whether he left the Antitrinitarian party or not, does not appear. Godfrey Schwartz gives to his controversy with Simonius the name, "*Scripta amoebea Squarcialupi et Simonii.*" The fifth and last pamphlet of the series, written by Squarcialupus, contained a severe attack upon the professions of Simonius, with regard to religion; and was entitled, "*Simonis Simonii Lucensis, primum Romani, tum Calviniani, deinde Lutherani, denuo Romani, semper autem Athei, summa Religio: Authore D. M. S. P. Cracoviæ, Typis Alexii Rodecii, 1588,*" 4to. This pamphlet is now of great rarity, having been rigidly suppressed.

Squarcialupus was an intimate friend of Dudithius, whom he visited in Poland; and to whom he addressed a learned treatise, in the form of a letter, "*On Comets in general, and particularly on that which was seen in the Year 1577.*" In this treatise he inveighed against the absurd notions of the astrologers respecting these bodies; discussed the nature, causes and effects of comets; exposed the opinion of those, who regarded them in any other light than as mere physical phenomena; and contended, that their nature

was unknown at the time at which he wrote. Dudithius sent this little work to his friend, Thomas Erastus, accompanied by a letter, in which he says, that nothing has ever been written on the subject more learned, more accurate, or more elegant, either by the ancients or moderns.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 81, 82. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 907—910; T. II. pp. 483. 676. 715—719. *F. Socini* Opera, T. I. Fol. 359—368. *Thomæ Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. ii. C. iv. p. 142.

92.

SIMON SIMONIUS, a Philosopher and Physician, and one of the most eminent men of his time, was born at Lucca, and left his native country, to join the Reformed Church at Geneva. Through the officious zeal of Beza and other Genevese Divines, he fell under ecclesiastical censure, and suffered imprisonment for holding Antitrinitarian opinions. He was admitted to a Professorship of Philosophy in the University of Leipzig; and for some time enjoyed the patronage and confidence of Augustus, Elector of Saxony. But his colleagues, through bigotry or envy, found means of bringing against him new accusations of heresy, and obliged him to resign his situation. As he refused to affix his name to *The Formula of Concord*, to which all Ministers and Tutors of Schools and Colleges were compelled by the Elector to subscribe, he was under the necessity of leaving the Electorate; and, going first to Vienna, and afterwards into Poland, he practised as a Physician. But he was fickle in his religious opinions, and outwardly conformed to the Catholic Church in Poland, in order that he might get appointed one of the Physicians to the King, although, for a time at least, he was in reality a Unitarian. The pamphlet of Squarcialupus, entitled “*Simonis Simonii Lucensis, primum Romani, tum Calviniani, deinde Lutherani, denuo Romani, semper autem Athei, summa Religio,*”

having often been referred to under the abridged title, "Simonis Religio," for a long time greatly puzzled the bibliographers, and was regarded by many as the work of Simonius himself. But it was conjectured by Bayle, and has since been well ascertained, that it was written by Squarcialupus, the implacable adversary of Simonius; and that its principal object was to bring a rival Physician into disrepute, by exposing his repeated tergiversation on the subject of religion. The initials D. M. S. P. given in the title-page, as those of the author, are probably intended to represent the words D[ominus] M[arcellus] S[quarcialupus] P[lumbinensis].

Besides two pamphlets, written in the course of this controversy, and several medical treatises, Simonius published a work, "De Sensuum Instrumentis," and another, "De vera Nobilitate," as well as a Book of Commentaries "in Ethica Aristotelis ad Nicomachum," "Aristotelis Analyticorum priorum Libri duo," "Quæstionum Dialecticarum Fragmentum," &c.

Many harsh and untrue things have been said of this learned, but unstable man, on no better authority than the bitter invectives of Squarcialupus, in whom the spirit of revenge, unmitigated by any redeeming quality, seems to have reached its utmost limit, during his controversy with Simonius.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 834—836. *Bruckeri* Hist. Crit. Philos. T. IV. P. i. p. 286; or *Enfield's* Hist. of Philosophy, Bk. viii. Chap. iii. Sect. ii. *Vogt*, Catal. Libr. Rar. pp. 627—629. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. SIMONIUS.

93.

JOHN KISZKA, of Czechanowicz, was a Lithuanian Knight, and a pupil of Castalio, to whose memory he erected a monument at Basle. While he was attending

the Greek lectures of Castalio in that city, Cœlius Secundus Curio was Professor of Eloquence and Belles-Lettres there ; and John Nicholas Stupanus, in his “ Panegyric Oration ” for Curio, asks, “ Quid superioribus annis Magnificum Dominum *Johannem Kiskam*, Palatini Vitebliensis Illustrissimi Principis filium, ex ultimis Lituaniæ terris, cum magnâ nobilium catervâ, ad nos usque proficisci compulit, quam Cœli potissimum videndi audiendique desiderium ? ” When Kiszka had finished his studies at Basle, Leo Curio, the brother of Cœlius, accompanied him on his return into Lithuania ; and remained in that country some years. With a knowledge of these facts, the reader will not find it difficult to account for the liberal tendencies of Kiszka.

He was the son-in-law of Constantine, Duke of Ostrog ; President General of Samogitia ; Castellan of Wilna ; and bore other high offices under the King of Poland, besides being a very extensive landed proprietor. He was Lord of seventy cities and towns, and about four hundred villages ; but dying without children, his hereditary possessions went to the already opulent Princes Radzivil. He was also the patron of several Unitarian Churches in Lithuania and Podlachia ; and in this capacity Faustus Socius dedicated to him his “ Disputation on the Nature or Essence of Jesus Christ the Son of God,” which was written in reply to the “ Hortatory Letter addressed to the Churches of Poland by Andrew Volanus.” The Dedication concludes with the following words. “ I offer and dedicate to you, Illustrious and Magnificent Sir, this fruit of my labours, not to solicit your patronage of what I advance, (for divine truth stands not in need of human patronage, and where I depart from it I have no wish to be supported,) but to engage and quicken your attention in reading, and studying the things here discussed : for it

becomes you more ardently to search after heavenly truth, inasmuch as you surpass in wealth the other members of the Church in this Kingdom, that you may exert all your power to promote and spread it, having discovered the truth by your own investigation, and not by that of others. God grant, that, despising all other things, you may ever solely devote yourself to his glory."

Kiszka addressed a letter to the Polish Churches, in which he invited them to hold a Synod, for the purpose of terminating the controversy concerning Magistracy, and the Use of Arms; and on the 6th of July, 1592, when near the close of his life, he committed to writing a Confession of his Faith in the Polish language, to guard against any sinister reports concerning his religion, which might arise after his death. Both these are alluded to by Sandius; but neither of them has ever been printed.

In a letter written by Faustus Socinus to John Volkelius, April 3rd, 1593, Socinus mourns over the sad fate of the Church in Philipovia, after the death of Kiszka, who was Lord of that district.

This liberal Nobleman frequently printed, at his own expense, such works as he thought likely to further the interests of truth. Martin Czechovicus tells us, that a treatise of his own, in the Polish language, against Pædobaptism, was printed at the expense of John Kiszka; and the most complete edition of Faustus Socinus's controversy with Francis Davidis, on the Invocation of Christ, was published in a similar way, in 1595, Socinus, as he himself states, having requested that he would defray the expense of its publication.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 82. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 424, 425, et *passim*; T. II. pp. 826. 840. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. iv. pp. 326, 327. *Schellhornii* Amoen. Literariæ, T. XIV. pp. 348. 377.

94.

STANISLAÛS TASZYCKI, of Luclavice, was a Polish Knight, and was once attached to the Court of Charles V. The family of Taszycki was much celebrated in Poland; and is very often mentioned in the Synodical Acts of the Unitarian Church, as well as by Polish authors. John Taszycki, an old man, and Judge of the district of Cracow, was called the *Nestor* of his time, on account of his singular wisdom, and persuasive eloquence. Some of his speeches in the Diet, delivered in the reign of King Sigismund, were inserted by Stanislaüs Orichowski, in his “*Annals*,” Bk. vi. Stanislaüs Taszycki belonged to the same family; and is described by Lubieniecius as a man of great merit, both in his private and public character. He was in part owner of the village of Luclavice, near Cracow; and founder of the Socinian Church there. At first he joined Farnovius and Wisnovius; but he afterwards changed his sentiments, and went over to the party of the Racovians, who held that Christ had no existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary.

When, in 1581, Martin Czechovicius wrote his “*Decision upon the Catechism of Paul Gilowski*,” Taszycki supplied the Dedication, which was addressed to Stanislaüs Szafraniec, Castellan of Sandomir. He also published a Speech addressed to Stephen, King of Poland, in 1585, on behalf of Alexius Rodecki, the printer, who had been imprisoned by an order from the King, obtained through the influence of the Jesuits, but who recovered his liberty, through the representations of Taszycki. The King, in his Reply, made use of the following remarkable words. “For myself, were it possible that the Catholic religion alone should flourish, I call God to witness, that I would do all in my power to promote it; nay, that I would shed my blood in its defence. But as it cannot be, particularly

in these unhappy times, till God shall bring it about in some other way, I think that religion should never be propagated by persecution and bloodshed; and even if I were not bound by an oath, reason itself, the constitution of the state, and what has taken place in France, would clearly teach me my duty upon this point. Fear not, therefore; for what you have said we have duly considered,—that the consciences of men can never be coerced.” Rodecki’s imprisonment had been occasioned by his printing Christian Francken’s “Books against the Trinity.” Francken, as the author, was banished the kingdom; and this is said to have been the only instance of any one suffering on account of his religious opinions, during the reign of Stephen Bathory. Rodecki, however, was deprived of his printing-press, and thrown into prison. He had also been incarcerated on a former occasion, for printing Palæologus’s Defence of Francis Davidis, which, as Schwartz observes, in his “Life and Writings of Dudithius,” he had done merely for the sake of gain. But after the aforesaid declaration of Stephen Bathory, the Unitarians appear to have been allowed to print their own books without molestation, till their expulsion from the kingdom of Poland. Faustus Socinus, indeed, writing to Matthew Radecius, January 8th, 1586, says that Alexius, who had been ejected from the Church by the Brethren, was prohibited, after his imprisonment, or rather after his liberation, from printing anything more. It would seem, however, from another letter of Faustus to John Balcerovicius, written more than five years later, and dated July 4th, 1591, that Alexius was then exercising his trade as a printer; and in 1594, he affixed his name to the title-page of Faustus’s treatise “De Jesu Christo Servatore,” so that the prohibition must then have been taken off, or he must have acted in defiance of the constituted authorities.

As no better opportunity will probably present itself in the course of this work, a few words may here be added, respecting the means employed by the Polish Unitarians, to make known their sentiments to the world, through the medium of the press.

They had one printing establishment in Poland, properly so called; and another in Lithuania. The former was originally at Cracow, from which it was transferred to Racow, a new settlement in the Palatinate of Sandomir. The printer was Alexius Rodecki, who lived at Cracow, and during the reign of Stephen Bathory printed many books, particularly some of the anonymous writings of Faustus Socinus. Rodecki sometimes ventured to give his own name in the imprint: at other times he appeared under the feigned names of Theophilus Adamides, or Adamowitz, and Alexander Turobinscius, or Turobinczyk. When he was considerably advanced in life, he removed to Racow, where he printed, among other things, a translation of the New Testament into the Polish language by Martin Czechowicius, A.D. 1577. At that time Racow was the property of John Siennynski, Palatine of Podolia, and father of James Siennynski, who was brought up among the Reformed, or Evangelical party, but, in the year 1600, joined the Antitrinitarians, and by his patronage and support, contributed greatly to the spread of their opinions. He built them a Church and a School, and enlarged their printing establishment at Racow. The printing, which was no longer conducted in a clandestine manner, was now superintended by Sebastian Sternacki, who married the daughter of Rodecki, and received the types of his father-in-law as a marriage portion with his wife. This establishment, which sent forth, not merely the works of the Socinians, but also many books of a purely literary and scientific character, remained in existence till 1638.

The press in Lithuania appears to have been more ancient than the one in Poland; and was first set up by Matthias Kawieczynski, Starost of Nieswicz. Budnæus's Version of the Bible into the Polish language was printed at Zaslav, a town of Lithuania, at the expense of Kawieczynski and his brother, by Daniel Leszczynski, in 1572. This printing establishment was transferred to the town of Losk, which belonged to John Kiszka, Castellan of Wilna; thence to Wilna, where the printer's name was Karkan; and thence again to Lubeck, which also belonged to Kiszka, and where the printing was carried on by Peter Blastus Kmita, who married the daughter of Karkan. He was succeeded by his son, John Kmita, whose successor was John Langius, a Lutheran. Lubeck was then the property of Janus, Duke Radzivil, Palatine of Wilna, and Commander in Chief of the army of the Grand Duke of Lithuania, who inherited the large estates of Kiszka, he having died without issue. This printing establishment was of longer duration than the one at Racow. But in the year 1655, or 1656, this also ceased to exist, in consequence partly of the ravages of an epidemic disease, and partly of an incursion of the Muscovites.

VIDEND. *Sundii* B. A. pp. 82, 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 363. 975, 976. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. ii. p. 60. *De Typographiis Unitariis*. in Polon. et Lithuan. pp. 201, 202.

95.

FLORIAN MORSTINIUS, (*Polon.* MORSZTYN,) was a Polish Knight, and Overseer (*Polon.* Bachmistrz) of the Salt-works of Wieliczka. His name frequently occurs in the Synodical Acts. He wrote some prefatory remarks to Czechovicius's reply to Farnovius's "Books against the Pacification of Luclavice;" and as Farnovius's work was inscribed to Stanislaus Szafraniec, Castellan of Sandomir, these remarks

were addressed to the same person. They were dated Wielitzka, May 20th, 1581, and published in the same year, in 4to.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 233. 509.

96.

SIMON RONEMBERG, sometimes called SIMON PHARMACOPÆUS, in allusion to his trade of an Apothecary, was a citizen of Cracow, and Elder of the first Unitarian Baptist Church in that place. He was an exceedingly zealous advocate of Adult Baptism by immersion. It was chiefly under his guidance, that the Unitarian Baptists of Poland first formed themselves into Churches, in the year 1569, about ten years before the arrival of Faustus Socinus in that country. In the autumn of that year, when their affairs were in a very discouraging state, Ronemberg went with Jerome Philipovius, George Schomann, and some others, into Moravia, for the purpose of holding a conference with the Brethren in Moravia, on subjects both of doctrine and discipline. The discipline they found to be admirable. According to Schomann, it was everything that could be desired. But the doctrine was such as they could not approve; for all the sects of the Moravian Baptists believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, and defended it with a pertinacity, which surprised and grieved Ronemberg and his companions. They returned to Poland dejected and dispirited; and for a time it was thought, that nothing could be done to revive their drooping cause. Almost all their Ministers, except Czechovicus, left off preaching. "But God," says Schomann, "taking compassion upon us, restored our fallen affairs, by that excellent man, Simon the Apothecary, as by another Ezra; and, in the midst of the existing tumults, erected a minis-

try, with the Baptism of adults." (Schomanni Testamentum, A. D. 1569.)

Such was the origin of the Unitarian Baptist Church at Cracow. It was formed in 1569, by Ronemberg, who was one of its Elders; and Gregory Pauli was appointed its first Pastor. But none were admitted to communion, except those who had been previously baptized by immersion. Some have thought, that George Schomann was the founder of this Church; but that is impossible, because he himself expressly says, in his Will, "On the last day of August, 1572, I, being in the forty-second year of my age, was baptized in the name of Christ at Chmielnik;" and, "in the year 1573, I was sent to the ministry of the Minor Church at Cracow." (Ibid.) Now it seems very improbable, that he should have been the founder of a Baptist Church, with which he had no pastoral connexion till four years after it was formed, and which had been established as much as three years before he himself was baptized; besides that he speaks, in the most direct and positive terms, of "Simon the Apothecary" as its founder, doubtless meaning, as Lubieniecus understood him, Simon Ronemberg, the Apothecary of Cracow.

The piety and zeal of this man were unquestionable; but in his notions respecting the necessity of Adult Baptism by immersion, and his advocacy of close communion, he displayed a zeal which was not according to knowledge. In the year 1580, Faustus Socinus wrote his "Disputation on Water Baptism," in which he contended, that this rite was meant for proselytes only; and not for those, who had been born of Christian parents. He also represented the practice of Infant Baptism as a great and hurtful error; and endeavoured to shew, that the baptized person must be a believer, which could not be the case with infants. A copy of this work was forwarded to Ronemberg, at his own

request; and after the lapse of between two and three years, Ronenberg addressed a letter to Socinus, in which, instead of answering his arguments, he urged him to join the Baptists, by way of healing the wounds of the Church. Socinus, in his reply, endeavours to shew, that the party with which Ronenberg acted was in error, and imposed an unnecessary burden on the Brethren, as they could receive none under this character, nor admit them to their communion, who did not, in mature life, submit to immersion, as an avowal of their faith in Christ.

Matthew Radecius, in a letter addressed to Cornelius Daems, and written June 18th, 1598, says, "All the pious have left the city of Cracow, except Simon Ronenberg the Apothecary, who cannot remove on account of his advanced age, for I believe him to be nearly a hundred years old."

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 713. *Scho-manni* Testam. p. 195. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. x. p. 227; C. xii. p. 240. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Chap. xiii. pp. 521, 522; Chap. xv. pp. 594—596. 600, 601. *Bibl. Fratr. Polonor.* T. I. pp. 428—431. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. iii. Sect. 2, § 5, p. 254. *T. Crenii* Animadv. Philol. Hist. P. iv. p. 242.

97.

SOPHIA SIEMICHOVIA was a noble Polish lady, whose name Sandius was unwilling to omit, in his list of Anti-trinitarian writers, because it was not only upon record, that she had addressed a letter to Faustus Socinus on the subject of Baptism, but Socinus's reply was preserved, and inserted in his published correspondence. She had requested him to interest the Church on this topic; and the main object of his reply is to shew, that Baptism, however necessary it might be in the infancy of the Gospel, is not now obligatory. He expresses his earnest desire, that the Church may be left free in this matter, because its discus-

sion has been found to impede the course of the Gospel, and he sees that it is daily the cause of much inconvenience, and much scandal; and that he may not seem himself to minister to this state of things, he makes a point of abstaining from all discussion of the subject, unless he is led into it by the importunity of his friends. Towards the close of his letter he says, "Would that there were many women like you in our Church, who took an interest in sacred things, and in acquiring a more exact knowledge of them, and particularly among those of your own rank and condition, noble matrons, and mothers of many children: for our whole Church might expect to derive thence many advantages. Only proceed in your desire of investigating divine truth, yet in such a manner as to weigh well all the arguments, and scriptural proofs with the greatest patience and gentleness, and above all things to beseech God, that he would open your mind to understand what is contained in his word."

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 833. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. pp. 431—433.

98.

NICHOLAS COCHANOVIVS, (*Polon.* KOCHANOWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, and Vice-Prefect of Radom, a town in the Palatinate of Sandomir. He is mentioned by Sandius as the author of Admonitory Verses to his Children in the Polish language, published first in the year 1584, and again in 1639, at Cracow, 4to., with the works of his nephew, John Cochánovius, the Prince of Polish Poets.

Count Krasinski mentions it "as a proof of the intellectual degradation, and the corruption of taste introduced by the Jesuits, that the most classical productions of the sixteenth century, the Augustan era of Polish literature, were not reprinted during a space of more than a century,

although after the revival of learning in Poland they went through many editions, and still continue to be reprinted. Thus," says the Count, "the poems of John Kochanowski ([who] died 1584), were printed several times before 1639; but from that year there was no new edition till 1767, which has since been followed by many others."

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 106. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Recapitulation, p. 552.

99.

PETER MACZYNSKI was a Polish Knight, and held the office of General, or Synodical Deacon, in the Polish Unitarian Churches. He translated the Latin Dictionary of Ambrose Calepinus into the Polish language. This Dictionary was first published in 1503, and subsequently enlarged by Passerat and others, till it filled two folio volumes.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 83. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 465. *Moreri*, Diet. Hist. Art. CALEPIN.

100.

ERASMUS OTVINOVIVS, (*Polon.* OTWINOWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, who, with eight of his brothers, embraced the Socinian doctrines. He flourished as early as the year 1564, at which time he must already have nearly attained the age of forty. The exact date of his birth is not known; but Sandius vouches for the facts, that he was living in 1608, and was upwards of ninety years of age at the time of his death. Christopher Lubieniecius, the elder, married his daughter, Anne. He was doubtless the same individual, of whom Smalcus relates, that he died about the end of May, 1614; and who, fifty years before, had snatched the wafer from the hand of the officiating Priest at Lublin, and trampled it in the mud. (Smalcus, apud Zeltneri

Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, Suppl. p. 1202.) Lubieniecius, in his "History of the Polish Reformation," (L. iii. C. i.) gives a particular account of this transaction, and of the consequences to which it led; and Count Krasinski, in his "Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland," (Vol. I. pp. 327—329,) mentions it, and details the circumstances connected with it, for the purpose of shewing the weakness of the authority of the Romish Church in the middle of the sixteenth century; and the contempt into which it had fallen at that time in Poland. "Erasmus Otwinowski," says he, "who afterwards became conspicuous as an adherent of the anti-Trinitarian sect, and as Head Master of their celebrated School at Racow, succeeded in convincing by his arguments a Roman Catholic Priest of the absurdity of the real presence in the Eucharist, so that the Priest promised to him never to expose it to the adoration of the people. The Priest did not, however, keep his promise, and carried the host in the usual manner at the solemn procession in the streets of Lublin. Otwinowski stopped the Priest in the midst of a large crowd of people, and loudly reproached him for performing a ceremony, the absurdity of which he had himself acknowledged. He demanded of the Priest to say the Lord's Prayer, and when the Clergyman said, 'Our Father, which art in heaven,' Otwinowski exclaimed, 'God is then in heaven, and not in the bread;' and saying this, he snatched from the hands of the Priest the box, containing the consecrated wafer, which he threw on the ground, and trampled under his feet. The assembled crowd murmured at the profanation of the established worship, but offered no violence to Otwinowski. The Priest sent for an armed force to arrest him, but he took shelter in the house of a Protestant Noble of the name of Suchodolski. This daring act, which was certainly repre-

hensible for its violence, but which may be excused by the zeal of Otwinowski, who was risking his life rather than suffer what he justly considered as an impious idolatry, produced, as it may be supposed, the greatest scandal among the Roman Catholics; and it could not but injure the belief in the transubstantiation, as no signs of heavenly wrath appeared to punish such a daring act of profanation of an object which was considered so sacred in the eyes of the Roman Catholics. He was accused before the tribunal of the Diet, and was in great danger of being condemned to a severe penalty; but his advocate, the celebrated Rey of Naglovice, who was at that time Member for Cracow, succeeded in giving a favourable turn to this affair. He defended him on the plea that there was no law that provided against a similar trespass, and that he could only be condemned to indemnify the Priest for the broken box, and the flour expended in making the wafer. Otwinowski was therefore acquitted; but a new law was enacted, which severely prohibited the disturbance of any religious worship, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant."

He translated all the parables of our Lord, which he dedicated to the Duke Ostrorog, Palatine of Kiof; and wrote the lives of all the women mentioned in the Old and New Testament. Both these were in Polish verse. He likewise composed a work, entitled "Christian Heroes," containing short sketches of the lives of illustrious Christians, who distinguished themselves during the Reformation in Poland and Lithuania. This also was in Polish verse, but was never printed, though it is frequently referred to by writers, who have interested themselves in the history of modern Unitarianism. A catalogue of the names of those, of whom an account is given in this work, together with other things, which appeared most worthy of preservation, was rendered into Latin by Benedict Wissowatius,

and subjoined to Andrew Wengerscius's "History of the Slavonian Reformation," printed at Amsterdam in 1679, 4to. Erasmus Otvinovius wrote another little work in Polish verse, entitled, "A Contest between a Baker and a Painter concerning their Gods, which was the more excellent?" The question is decided in favour of the Painter, because his God remains; whereas that of the Baker is obnoxious to many changes. In Polish literature, Erasmus Otvinovius is known as the translator of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 83, 84. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 580, 581. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. i. p. 171. *Smalcii* *Diarium*, A. D. 1614, p. 1202. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. I. Pt. ii. Chap. vii. pp. 327—329.

101.

GEORGE OTVINOVIVS, (*Polon.* OTWINOWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, and one of the eight brothers of Erasmus Otvinovius; but the only one, of whom Sandius and Bock have preserved any account. The latter of these writers mentions another person of the name of Otvinovius, whom he supposes to have been the son either of Erasmus or George; and who was thrown into prison in the year 1634, and not liberated in 1641, although great interest had been made, in the mean time, with the Bishop of Cracow, to procure his enlargement.

Lubieniecius, the historian, describes George Otvinovius as a learned and skilful, as well as pious man; and says, that he originally embraced a monastic life, but soon abandoned it, and spent the remainder of his days with his brother Erasmus, with whom he resided on terms of the greatest harmony and affection. He died on the 26th of February, 1608.

The only work ascribed to him is, A MS. Book of Ex-

tracts from the Scriptures, and ancient Christian Fathers; compiled about the end of the sixteenth century.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 84. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 581, 582. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. ubi supra. *Smalcii* Diarium, A.D. 1608, p. 1184.

102.

MATTHEW RADECIUS, (*Polon.* RADECKE, or RADETZKI,) the father of Valentine Radecius the elder, was born at Dantzic, on old Michaelmas-day, 1540. Having acquired the rudiments of his education in his native city, he went to the University of Königsberg, of which he was admitted a student, July 18th, 1560, during the Rectorship of John Hoffmann; but being too poor to pay the usual entrance-fee, it was not demanded of him. When he had finished his academical course, he discharged the office of Secretary in his native city for twenty-six years, during which time he was very unsettled in his religious opinions. He was born of Catholic parents, and therefore brought up a Catholic; but he afterwards joined the Lutherans, then the Reformed, then the Mennonites, and last of all the Socinians.

How the last of these changes was brought about has never been distinctly ascertained. An Antitrinitarian Church had existed at Dantzic from the year 1580; and it is stated, in the Synodical Acts, under the year 1582, that Radecius had been driven from Holland, on account of his Unitarianism. It is evident, therefore, that he had imbibed Unitarian opinions at that time; and it appears from his correspondence with Faustus Socinus, that he was a leading person in the Antitrinitarian Church at Dantzic from the year 1584. But it was not till the spring of 1592, that he made a public profession of Unitarian sentiments by Baptism. Soon after this, he was deprived of his office of Secretary to the Magistrates.

He was baptized no less than three times: first, when an infant, by sprinkling, in the Catholic Church; then, by affusion, when he joined the Mennonites; and lastly, by immersion, when he became a Socinian. Of this he has himself given a particular account, in his "*Ursachen, warum er sich von Dantzig weggemachet,*" u. s. w. His being admitted into the Socinian Church by immersion was laid to his charge as a heinous offence; and being commanded by the Senate of Dantzie, on the 17th of August, 1592, to defend himself against this charge, and not choosing to deny what had taken place, or to recant, he was formally deprived of his office, and immediately left Dantzie, with his wife and eight children.

Sandius, and, after him, Lauterbach, assert that Radecius was appointed Pastor of Smigel: but Boek calls in question the correctness of this assertion, because he does not find it mentioned in the Manuscript Acts, although he admits, that the first thing which Radecius did, after he left Dantzie, was to go to Smigel, where he took up his temporary abode, and where, for a short period, he afterwards taught, in the year 1605. There is no doubt, that, in the year 1599, he presided over the Church at Dantzie, or Buskow; but being succeeded in that place by Ostorod, he removed, in 1603, to Racow, and after holding the office of Deacon, and Steward of the College at Racow for a few years, died there. During his residence at Racow, he attended the Conferences held in the house of Smalcus, which began January 7th, 1606; were suspended from Feb. 22nd to Nov. 28th of that year, on account of the disturbed state of Poland; and terminated January 3rd, 1609. The substance of these Conferences was committed to writing, and, as Sandius conjectures, by Matthew Radecius, who, instead of writing his name at length, like the rest of those who were present at them, only attached his initials, M. R.

Smalcius, in his Diary, makes the following memorandum of his death. "On the 29th of March, 1612, aged seventy-three years and a half, at Racow, calmly fell asleep in the Lord, Matthew Radecius, a most upright and pious man, Secretary to the City of Dantzic for twenty-six years, who had come from that city to Smigel as an exile, for the sake of acquiring a knowledge of the truth, and passing a more quiet life, in the same year and month in which I came, viz. Sept. 1502." (Zeltneri Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, Supplem. p. 1195.) In the same part of his Diary, Smalcius represents him as having discharged the ministerial office nine years at Buskow, and ten at Racow; and mentions it as a remarkable fact, that he was born on the day of the autumnal, and died on that of the vernal equinox. Two of his sons, and two of his daughters, attained the age of maturity. Valentine, one of the sons, adopted his father's religious sentiments, and acquired considerable eminence among the Unitarians of Transylvania. Matthew, the other son, appears to have held different views; but what they were does not very clearly appear. The latter died at Padua, March 4th, 1607. The elder of the two daughters was married to James Frencelius, who was born at Elbing, but practised as a Surgeon at Lublin, and professed himself a Socinian. The younger daughter became the wife of Andrew Voidovius.

As an author, Radecius was dogmatical, and his style was characterized by such acerbity, that Bock classes him with Michael Servetus, George Blandrata, John Sylvanus, Francis Davidis and Gregory Pauli. The following is a catalogue of his writings.

1. A Paper against Erasmus Johannis, impugning the Doctrine of Christ's Preëxistence. This was prepared about the year 1584, but never published.

2. Letters to Faustus Socinus, written in and about

1584, and treating upon the Restoration of the Church, the Adoration of Christ, and other Questions. In this correspondence, Radecius alluded to his own paper against Erasmus Johannis on the Preëxistence of Christ, and requested a sight of the remarks which Socinus had addressed to the same person upon the same subject; in reply to which Socinus says, that he has only one copy, and that so badly written, that it can scarcely be read by any one but himself. He then takes occasion to state, that he has seen Radecius's paper, and read it with great pleasure and satisfaction; and that he entirely approves of all which Radecius has said respecting the person, dignity and power of Christ, except that he regards it as a refutation of the opinions held by Trinitarians, rather than of those held by Arians. Socinus, in the course of this correspondence, treats at great length the question concerning the Invocation of Christ; but it does not appear, that he was able to bring Radecius over to his own opinion on that subject. Radecius's part of the correspondence was never printed.

3. Reasons why Matthew Radecke, who acted as Secretary to the City of Dantzic for twenty-six Years, removed from that Place, and settled elsewhere. Racow, 1593.

4. Answer of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ at Smigel to the Explanation of the Apostles' Creed, by the noble and most honourable M. Sigmund Schlichtingius of Starpel, which he caused to be publicly printed against the aforesaid Church, in the Year 1592. This as well as the preceding work was written in German; but it has no date, though it was probably printed at Racow, in 1593. Sandius and Lanterbach attributed it to Wolfgang Schlichtingius, who wrote the Preface; but Boeck claims it, and apparently on sufficient grounds, as the production of Matthew Radecius.

5. On the Millennium. This also was written in Ger-

man, and published about the year 1590, at which time Budzinius, Gregory Pauli and Andrew Lubieniecius, treated upon the same subject.

6. A Letter to Andrew Voidovius, written from Buskow, January 20th, 1598, and published with the Correspondence of F. Socinus.

7. A Letter to Cornelius Daems, who was residing at Gouda, in Holland, to inform him of the Calamity sustained by F. Socinus at Cracow; written June 18th, 1598, and inserted in the "Animadversiones Philol. Hist." of Thomas Crenius.

8. Conversations, or Theological Exercises, held at various Times in the House of Valentine Smalcus.

9. A Correspondence with Ernest Solmer on the Immortality of the Soul.

In addition to the preceding, two other works in German have been attributed to Matthew Radecius, though apparently without any good authority, the style being altogether different from his.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 84. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 700—709. Hist. Socinianismi Prussici, § vii. pp. 12—15. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1596. 1603. 1612. *T. Crenii* Animadv. Philol. Hist. P. iv. pp. 233—242.

103.

ZGLOBICIUS. A person bearing this name is often mentioned in Faustus Socinus's third letter to Matthew Radecius. It appears, that his views respecting the Invocation of Christ coincided with those of Socinus; and that he had carried on a correspondence with Radecius upon that subject. But who, or what he was, is altogether unknown. Bock was unable to discover any clue to his personal history.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1044. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 389, 390.

104.

Dr. RAPHAEL RITTER, though of German extraction, as may be inferred from his name, was born in London; and was the reputed author of a small tract, entitled, "A brief Demonstration, that Christ is not himself God the Father, or coëqual with him." This tract, which he was at great pains to disseminate in Ducal Prussia, and among the Students in the University of Königsberg, was answered by John Wigand, Bishop of Pomerania, in a work, entitled, "Arian Mists, spread in Prussia by Mr. Raphael Ritter, of London, dispersed by the Light of Divine Truth. Königsberg, 1575," 8vo. But that the author of the tract, to which this was intended as a reply, was no Arian, appears evident from the tract itself; for the writer not only disavows a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, and that of two natures in the person of Christ, but argues also against our Lord's preëxistence. No copy of the "Brevis Demonstratio" has ever come under the present writer's observation; but the whole of it was interwoven into the reply, and Sandius, in his account of Ritter, has extracted the concluding part of it, of which the following is a translation.

"It cannot be dissembled, that many are ignorant, why Christ is called 'the Son of God.' They think that he was begotten of the essence, or substance of God, and is therefore called 'the Son of God.' This is a very ancient error, but must not be tolerated on that account. For the God Jesus neither is, nor is called 'the Son of God,' on account of his being born of the substance of God. These are the idle dreams of the Sophists. The pious reader should rather learn, from the Gospel, the cause of Jesus Christ being called 'the Son of God:' for there the angel, instructing the Virgin Mary concerning the mode of her wonderful conception, addresses her after this manner.

‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*.’ Here the cause of the Messiah’s being called ‘the Son of God’ is pointed out with the greatest clearness; namely, that he was conceived, and born without the intervention of man. Therefore Gabriel says, ‘that holy thing shall be called *the Son of God*,’ because, after the Holy Spirit had come upon her, and the power of the Most High had overshadowed her, a most holy infant would be conceived. But let it be observed, that the angel did not say of Christ, that he had formerly been called ‘the Son of God,’ or that he was then ‘the Son of God;’ but that he would be called ‘the Son of God,’ when he was born. It was not that Spirit, therefore, which had descended from heaven, but that man, who was born of the Virgin Mary, who was called ‘the Son of God;’ and that, simply because he was conceived, and born, by the immediate agency of God, contrary to the order of nature. Hence it is, that, though all the Prophets had predicted that he would come, and had said many things concerning him, yet he was nowhere called ‘the Son of God’ till he appeared, and was baptized in the Jordan. For Jesus Christ is ‘a man,’ as the Apostle calls him. ‘The Son of man,’ however, as he calls himself, is nevertheless God; but only in the way in which we have stated above. Away then with the fables, and inventions of the Sophists, about a Tri-une God, and about a Christ ‘begotten of the Father before all worlds;’ about two natures in this Christ; and similar trifles! There is One God, whom no man hath at any time seen. Christ is God, because he is ‘the image of God.’ But this God is a real man, consisting of a soul and flesh, and born of the Virgin Mary; through whom to God, the Father, be praise and honour for ever. Amen.”

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 84—86. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 712, 713.

105.

MATTHEW HAMONT, by trade a ploughwright, of Hethersett, in the county of Norfolk, three miles from Norwich, was cited to appear before the Bishop of that diocese, in the year 1579, for having, as Stowe observes, denied Christ our Saviour. When he made his appearance, he was charged with having given publicity to the following heretical propositions; namely, that the New Testament and the Gospel of Christ were pure folly, a human invention and mere fable; that man was restored to favour by the divine mercy alone, and not by the blood, death and passion of Christ; that Christ is not God, nor the Saviour of the world, but a mere man, a sinner, and an abominable idol, and that all who worship him are abominable idolaters; that Christ did not rise from the dead, or ascend to heaven, by the power of his own divinity; that the Holy Ghost is not God, but a mere non-entity; and that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are useless rites. The probability is, that, allowing for the gross misrepresentations of ignorance and bigotry, Hamont had called in question the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures; the doctrine of Satisfaction, or a vicarious Atonement; the deity of Christ, his claim to divine homage, and his power to raise himself from the dead; the personality of the Holy Spirit; and the rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as perpetual, and standing ordinances in the Christian Church. In any other sense, the charges against him are absurd and incredible: yet on these charges, he was condemned in the Consistory Court, on the 13th of April, 1579, and handed over to the custody of the Sheriff of Norwich. For these things, and for having spoken blasphemous words against the Queen and her Council, he was condemned to have his ears cut off,

and to be burnt alive; and this cruel sentence was carried into execution in the month of May of the same year,—the former part of it in the market-place, and the latter at the Castle Moat of Norwich. Camden, in his *Annals of Elizabeth*, (p. 285,) says, “The execrable impiety of Matthew Hamont, which about this time he openly poured forth against God and his Christ, and which is, I hope, extinct with his burning alive, is rather to be buried in oblivion, than remembered.” On this passage, Limborch remarks, in a letter to Locke, dated Amsterdam, June 23rd, 1699, “I lately read Camden’s *History of England under Elizabeth*, in the Second Part of which, Anno 1579, I found these words. ‘*Execranda Matthæi Hamonti impietas, quæ in Deum Christumque ejus Norwici hoc tempore debacchata est, et cum illius vivicomburio, ut spero, extincta, oblivione potius est obruenda, quam memoranda.*’ I wish Camden had a little more distinctly indicated this impiety, that the atrocity of a crime, deserving to be visited by so horrible a punishment, might have been made manifest. We know that harmless errors are sometimes called execrable blasphemies and impieties by Theologians, in order that they may find out some pretext for the cruelties which they inflict upon those who differ from them. I have thus far sought in vain for a more exact account of this Hamont, in authors to whom I have access: but I doubt not that such an account may be found in English writers. You would oblige me, if you could, without inconvenience, supply me with his history.” In his answer, Mr. Locke says, that he has sought for a more exact account of Hamont, but has not been able to meet with any writer, who throws further light upon the subject. In a subsequent letter, however, Mr. Locke gives from Hollinshed the details, which have already been repeated at the beginning of this article. Crakanthorp also, in his

Defence of the Church of England against the Archbishop of Spalatro, says, "In the 21st of Elizabeth one Hamont, an Arian, with insolent madness blasphemed Christ, and the Gospel, and denied that Christ was God. He was burnt to ashes at Norwich, and suffered the punishment justly due to his blasphemy."

VIDEND. *Stowe's Chronicle*, A. D. 1579. *Locke's Familiar Letters*, Lond. 1708, 8vo. pp. 435, 436. 442. 446, 447. *Camdeni Annales Rerum Anglican. et Hibernic.*, regnante Elizabetha, ad A. S. 1589. Lond. 1615, Fol. l. c. *D. Rich. Crakanthorp*, *Defensio Eccles. Anglican. contra M. Antonii de Dominis*, D. Archiepisc. Spalatensis Injurias. Lond. 1625, C. xxxiii. § xvii. p. 204.

106.

JOHN LEWES is mentioned, in *Stowe's Chronicle*, under the year 1583, in the following terms. "On the eighteenth daie of September, John Lewes, who named himself Abbot, an obstinate heretike; denieing the godhead of Christ, and holding divers other detestable heresies (much like to his predecessor Matthew Hamont) was burnt at Norwich." *Crakanthorp* also says, that "three years after" the death of Hamont, "John Lewes began openly to vomit forth similar blasphemy; and he also was burnt by the same kind of punishment at Norwich."

VIDEND. *Stowe's Chron.* A. D. 1583. *Locke's Familiar Letters*, p. 447. *Crakanthorp*, *Defensio Eccles. Anglic.* etc.

107.

JEROME ? PIEKARSCIUS, (*Polon.* PIEKARSKI,) was a person of noble rank and great wealth, and the proprietor of many estates. His Christian name is never mentioned in the Synodical Acts; but it is not improbable that he was the Jerome Piescarski, or Pickarski, who so ably seconded Peter Gonesius, when that intrepid reformer attacked the prevailing doctrines respecting the Trinity and Pædo-Bap-

tism, at the Synod of Brzesc, in 1558. (Vide *Art.* 44.) Piekarski was once a Minister of the Reformed Church, but passed over to the Antitrinitarians; and defended the opinions of this party, at the Synod of Lublin, in the year 1578, at which time he is said to have gone from Thrace into Poland. The Acts of the Synod, held at Lublin in 1585, state, that he was removed from the communion of the Church, on account of his partiality to the opinions of the Judaizers. It is recorded, by the Polish historians, that one *Michael* (or *Caspar*) Piekarski attempted to take away the life of Sigismund III., King of Poland, in 1620, for which he suffered death as a regicide.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 631. *Smalcii Diarium*, Nov. 15th, 1620, apud *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. p. 1216.

108.

DEMETRIUS HUNYADI, (sometimes written HUNIADES, and HUNJADINUS,) was the second Superintendent of the Unitarian Church of Transylvania, in which office he succeeded the unfortunate Francis Davidis, in 1579. It was not without opposition, that he was appointed to this situation; but under his Superintendence, a union was effected among the Antitrinitarians of Transylvania, to which they probably owe their continued existence, as a religious body, to this day. He retained the office of Superintendent till his death, which took place in 1592, when he was succeeded by George Enyedi. His first object, after his appointment, was to compose a Confession of Faith, and to re-establish the Baptism of Infants in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, (and, as some say, the observance of the Lord's Supper,) which had fallen into disuse, during the Superintendence of F. Davidis. Only about eighteen out of two hundred and seventy Ministers refused their assent to this Confession. The rest were gained over by the persuasion,

or threats of Blandrata, at whose suggestion it was drawn up, and to whose revision it was submitted. It obtained the approbation of the general Synod, convened by Blandrata at Clausenburg, on the first of July, 1579.* Hunyadi also composed, by the advice of Blandrata, a small tract, in which he exhorted the Church to resume the practice of Infant Baptism, &c. This was read in the Consistory of Clausenburg, Sept. 14th, 1579, before the Senate; but appears not to have been printed.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 86. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 417. Mon. Rep. Vol. XV. (1820) p. 194. *Rees's* Hist. Introd. to Racov. Catech. pp. lxii, lxiii.

109.

THEODOSIUS SCHIMBERG flourished about the end of the sixteenth century; and, if we may judge from the names with which we find his associated, belonged to that section of the Unitarian body, which thought it idolatrous to pay divine honours to Jesus Christ. Sandius gives no particulars of his personal history; but ascribes to him a treatise, On the Errors of Trinitarians. He wrote a Preface to John Sommer's Books against Peter Carolius, A. D. 1582, in which he applied to the doctrine of the Trinity the terms "horrible" and "blasphemous," and charged Athanasius with causing the death of Arius. He also wrote a Preface to "Some Treatises on the Christian Religion," published in 1583, 8vo., and purporting to have been printed at Ingolstadt.

VIDEND. *Art.* 81. *Sandii* B. A. p. 86. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 762.

110.

CONRAD GRASER is classed by Sandius among Antitrinitarians: yet that author says, "I know not whether this be the same as he, concerning whom König writes, in his 'Bibliotheca Vetus et Nova,'—'Conrad Graser, a Frank,

* APPENDIX, No. vi.

was born in the year 1557, and died in the year 1613. He presided over the Church and Gymnasium at Thorn. He composed a Commentary on Daniel, and the Apocalypse of John, in 4to. He is said also to have translated Rabbi Joseph Albo's '*Sepher Hikkarim* from Hebrew into Latin.'" There seems no reason to doubt, that the Conrad Graser mentioned by Sandius is the one, of whom König gives the above description. This plainly appears from a passage found in his Commentary on the 9th Chapter of Daniel, p. 159, and prefixed to the Theological Treatises of Przypcovius, in which he says, "that the Israëlitish Church, in its better times, had more correct views of the mystery of the Trinity, than the Gentile Church ever had;" that "ancient Israël was never so curious and rash as publicly to dispute concerning the essence of God;" and that "if its practice had ever been observed, or were still observed in the Catholic Church, we should have a much simpler Theology in the present day, and there would be less of ambitious contention, and fewer scandalous controversies."

Bock doubts, however, whether Conrad Graser has been rightly placed by Sandius among Antitrinitarians; and remarks, that, in the life of him by Melchior Adam, there is nothing, which could bring upon him the suspicion of Neö-Photinianism. Yet there are circumstances mentioned by Melchior Adam, which, though, in the absence of the fact, that Sandius has represented him as an Antitrinitarian, they might not have led us to doubt the orthodoxy of his creed, yet tend, with that fact before us, to impart to the representation of Sandius a high degree of probability. "When in the visitation of the sick," says his biographer, "and in the preparation for a happy departure out of this life, he found, that those theological controversies, which beget a knowledge that puffeth up, but do not quiet uneasy consciences, and which, in the present day, are agitated with

great contention of minds, and excite great tumults in the state, are of no use whatever, nay rather bewilder the consciences of common people, just as human inventions did in Catholic times, he began to refrain from them with his whole mind, and in his public discourses to set forth those things only, which tend to produce a saving faith in Christ, to promote true piety according to the word of God, and to administer consolation in life and death." In another place his biographer says, "there exists a writing entitled 'The last Words of Conrad Graser,' in which he shews that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and of the Virgin Mary, is the true Messiah, who was promised, and is now come, and has performed his duty, by dying for the life of the world." This is tantamount to a denial of the eternal sonship of Jesus Christ, or of his generation before all worlds, and is therefore a virtual abandonment of the doctrine of the Trinity.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 86. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 413. *Conr. Graseri* Comm. in Dan. ix. p. 159, apud *Sam. Przypcovii* Cogitationes Sacrae ad Init. Evang. Matth., et Omnes Epistolas Apostol. etc. Fol. 372. *Melch. Adami* Vitæ German. Theologor. pp. 400—403.

111.

CHRISTIAN FRANCKEN was a native of Gardeleben, a town of the Old Mark of Brandenburg. *Bock* calls him "homo omnium partium planus;" and in these few words we have an exact delineation of his character. He was once a Jesuit at Rome; but in the year 1580, he avowed himself a Protestant of the Evangelico-Lutheran persuasion, and went to the University of Altorf, where he became a public lecturer. But he was dismissed from Altorf, and in 1583, after much wavering and indecision, joined that section of the Antitrinitarian body, which regarded the Father only as the proper object of religious worship,

and of which Francis Davidis was the ostensible head. There exists a copper-plate portrait of Francken, with a brief account of his life, in which he is called Rector of the School of *Schmidnik*, an evident mistake for *Chmielnik*; and is said to have died at Clausenburg, in the year 1590. But Bock informs us, that he left the Antitrinitarians, and died a Roman Catholic at Prague, towards the close of the sixteenth century. Our concern with him, however, is as an Antitrinitarian, which he first professed himself, as was before stated, in 1583. In the year following, he was appointed to the Rectorship of the School at Chmielnik; and at a Synod, held in that town during the same year, he challenged any of the Ministers present to a discussion of the question, "Whether, since Christ is not God in the highest sense, he ought to be worshiped with religious adoration?" This challenge was thrown out in a very haughty and supercilious manner; and accompanied by an expression of contempt for the erudition and capacity of the Ministers present. That he might, by the number of his arguments, confound and overwhelm any one who should have the temerity to accept his challenge, he framed no less than fifty consecutive reasons, which he had premeditated, against the Invocation of Christ. The boldness of the challenge created some uneasiness, as well as surprise; and Faustus Socinus, although his repeated applications for admission to the communion of the Church had till that time been rejected, was urged by the Ministers present to accept the challenge. Francken commenced the disputation in so abrupt and impetuous a manner, that Socinus, though he listened with attention, was advised to note down the heads of his adversary's arguments, lest, in the heat of the moment, he should overlook some of them. But trusting to his memory he would not avail himself of the use of his pen; and having patiently heard the whole

of Francken's arguments, he proceeded to answer all of them precisely in the order in which they had been put. This he did so fully and satisfactorily, that his opponent was silenced; and not being able to retort a single word, was under the necessity of pleading, that he had not come to the discussion duly prepared, and, to the surprise of all present, withdrew from the assembly, in a state of the utmost confusion.

The following list probably comprises the whole of Christian Francken's writings.

1. An Answer to three Speeches of Warcowicki the Jesuit, in which he urges King Stephen, and the Senators, to persecute the Protestants: under the name of Nicholas Regius.

2. A short Jesuitical Conference, very useful to the whole Christian World, but more particularly to the Imperial City of Vienna, for rightly apprehending the Religion of the Jesuits, which has not yet been sufficiently understood: held by Paul Florenius, Doctor and Professor of Theology, with Christian Francken, Professor of Philosophy, in the Imperial Gymnasium of the Jesuits at Vienna, January 20th, 1578. Leipzig, 1580, 8vo.; Basle, 1580, 8vo.; 1581, 8vo. Placcius mentions an English version of this Conference by W.C., London, 1580. Another appears to have been published in London, A.D. 1630, which is mentioned in the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library.

3. A Letter bewailing the Author's Departure from the Society of Jesus and the Church, &c. Wirtzburg, 1583, 4to.

4. A Disputation with Faustus Socinus on the religious Worship of Jesus Christ. Francken published his own account of this Disputation: but, as he himself acknowledged to several persons, he rather endeavoured to give a representation of what Socinus ought to have said, agree-

ably to his own sentiments, than a statement of the arguments actually advanced by him in the debate on the Invocation of Christ. This induced Socinus to draw up an account of the Disputation, of which a description has already been given under *Article* 90, pp. 336, 337.

5. A Letter to the Synod of the Polish Brethren held at Wengrow, 1584. The subject of this Letter was the same as that of the preceding Disputation. It was answered by Andrew Vitrelinus in the name of the Synod, May, 1584; but neither the Letter nor the Reply was published.

6. Some Books against the Trinity, printed at Cracow by Alexius Rodecki, about the year 1585. Gorscius replied to this work, and in his Preface exhorted the King of Poland to defend the Catholic Religion, and severely reproved the Poles for having received Christian Francken, after he had been driven out of France and Germany. This appeal was not made in vain: for Francken immediately became an object of persecution, and his printer was involved in great trouble and expense. The latter was cast into prison, and deprived of his types and his press. (Vide *Art.* 94.) The former, who fled into Transylvania, was appointed to the office of Reader at Clausenburg, which office he held till 1590.

7. A Recital of the principal Causes, why Christians, though fickle and fluctuating in many Doctrines of Religion, are yet constant in professing their Belief of that of the Trinity.

8. The remainder of Francken's writings are as follow. On the War against the Turks; The Tub of Diogenes; A Type of the Truth of Consciences; An Analysis of Christian Strife, etc. Prague, 1595, 4to. On the Idolatry of the Jesuits in the Adoration of Bread and Wine. Basle, 1580, 8vo. A Dispute between a Theologian and a Phi-

losopher on the Uncertainty of the Christian Religion. Clausenb. 1593, 4to.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 86, 87. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 360—364. 1090. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 46. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. i. p. 13; Chap. iv. pp. 332, 333.

112.

ERASMUS JOHANNIS was born at Soltwedel, in the Old Mark of Brandenburg; and was known among the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf by the name of *Desiderius Ulricus*. He studied at Leipzig, and afterwards went to Geneva, where he had frequent opportunities of seeing and conversing with Theodore Beza. During his stay at Geneva, the exact time of which is not known, he imbibed Antitrinitarian opinions, either from Lælius Socinus, or some of the Italian associates of that great man, who were then to be met with in almost every part of Switzerland. From Geneva he went into Holland, where he was the first person, who attempted to excite public attention to the cause of Antitrinitarianism. His eminence as a Hebrew scholar caused him to be appointed Rector of the Grammar School at Antwerp; and while he was in this situation, he published anonymously a little work, in defence of Arianism, entitled, “The Manual of a Christian Man, compiled from the more remarkable Passages of Scripture, and divided into fifty-two Sections.” This was printed at Antwerp in 1583, 16mo., with the motto, “If ye know these things, happy will ye be if ye do them;” and was the precursor of a larger work, entitled, “A Discourse, in which it is shewn, that the Reign of Antichrist commenced immediately after the Times of the Apostles, and therefore that all the Councils, not excepting even that of Nice, were infected with that Pest.” A French translation of this work was published, but few copies got into circulation,

as it was suppressed by public authority. Brandt gives the following summary of its contents.

The design of this Discourse was to shew, as well from the Epistles of Paul, as from the history of the primitive Churches, that even the first five hundred years were not free from Antichristian errors; and ought therefore to be regarded as forming part of the Kingdom of Antichrist. He further inferred, that, unless we should pass by the whole series of fifteen hundred years, which have elapsed since the days of the Apostles, there could be no true, or lasting reformation: that, in order to procure such reformation, it would be necessary to conform to the true Apostolic Churches, both in doctrine and discipline; and that, in so doing, it would be better to abolish, and keep entirely out of view the new phraseology invented by the Fathers, and to confine ourselves to that simplicity of expression, in matters pertaining to religion, of which Christ and his Apostles have left us an example. He adds, that no one ought to conclude, from his exposing the errors of the Fathers, that he aimed at condemning them, or rejecting their books; but that we should not confine ourselves or others, much less the Church of Christ, to any of the writings or expressions of the Councils and Fathers, as if any man were obliged to speak and believe just as they did; and as if all were heretics, who did not use their language. He concludes with these words. "If then any one thinks himself indispensably obliged to make use of new and strange terms, in order to express his belief in matters of religion, so that the words of Prophets and Apostles cannot serve him; it is most certain, that not only the words, but the doctrine and religion, are new, else he could not fail to discover in the Scriptures expressions adapted to convey his meaning." Brandt adds, "This book was not well received, but construed as if the author aimed at calling

everything in question, and setting himself at the head of a party, and disturbing the national Church. It was likewise resolved to seize upon the books, and the writer too. But such care and discretion were used in pursuing him, that he was sought for in one town after another, and even the very place where they knew he lodged the night before; in so much, that they only obliged him to go off privately, and leave the country."

Archdeacon Blackburne, alluding to the liberties which Erasmus Johannis took with antiquity, says, "the times were not yet ripe for the toleration of these sentiments, and the poor man, who was hardly enough to venture them with the public, was obliged to fly his country."

From Holland he went into Poland, and passed thence into Transylvania, where the office of Pastor of a Church at Clausenburg was committed to him, on condition that, in his public discourses, he should not touch upon the subject of Christ's præexistence. He was known to entertain opinions on this point, at variance with the great body of Unitarians in Poland and Transylvania; and silence upon this topic was the only restriction laid upon him.

In 1584, the year in which he left Antwerp, and very soon after he had settled at Clausenburg, he went to Cracow, and requested permission to offer to the Unitarian Churches in Poland the reasons, which kept him from embracing the opinion, that there was no only-begotten Son of God before the man Jesus of Nazareth was born of the Virgin Mary. The permission sought was granted, and, by Erasmus's own consent, the Churches committed the province of answering his arguments to one of their brethren. The individual selected for this purpose was Faustus Socinus, who disputed with him two days, in a calm and friendly manner. Erasmus, during his stay at Cracow, drew up, and sent to Socinus, the heads of this

debate; but Socinus, on reading them, found that Erasmus had mistaken some things advanced by him, and had not given a perfectly correct representation of others. This induced him to draw up a refutation of the arguments and reasonings offered by Erasmus, to prove that Christ was the only-begotten Son of God before he was born of the Virgin Mary. It was printed at Racow in 1595, 8vo., and dedicated to Jerome Moscorovius. To this work was added a letter of Erasmus, with Socinus's reply. Erasmus's own account of the arguments brought forward in this disputation was printed by Alexius Rodecki at Cracow, in 1585, under the title, "Antitheses of the Doctrine of Christ and Antichrist concerning the true God." The name of the author was not prefixed to this book; but we learn, from a letter of F. Socinus to Matthew Radecius, that it was the production of Erasmus Johannis. It is mentioned by Bayle; and Schellhorn erroneously supposed it to be the same as the volume printed at Antwerp.

The rest of the life of Erasmus Johannis appears to have been spent in the discharge of his pastoral duties at Clausenburg, where he probably died about the close of the sixteenth century. That he was living in 1590 appears from a letter, which he addressed to Faustus Socinus in that year; and in which he requests his correspondent's opinion concerning "A Treatise on the Causes of Eternal Life," which he had forwarded to Cracow, for his perusal.

Besides the works of Erasmus already mentioned, he wrote, A Book concerning the Four Monarchies; and a Commentary upon the Apocalypse. He is also said, by Sandius, to have corrected the version of the Hebrew Bible by Junius and Tremellius, in the prophetical part.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 87, 88. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 419—423. 1090, 1091. *Hoornbeek*, Summa Controv. L. vii. p. 568. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinianismi Altorf. pp. 244—247. *Schellhornii* Amœnitates

Literariæ, T. II. pp. 355, 356. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries, Bk. xiii. A. D. 1584, Vol. I. pp. 399, 400. *De la Roche's* Abridgment, Vol. I. pp. 218—221. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. SOCIN. Not. k. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. iv. pp. 334, 335. The Confessional, 2nd Ed. Lond. 1767, 8vo. p. 22.

113.

EVERHARD SPANGENBERG was a Preacher in the Reformed Church at Antwerp. He was born about the year 1550, and had doubts respecting the Trinity while yet a youth. At first he embraced and defended Arianism; but he afterwards joined the Socinian party; and as his change of opinion rendered it necessary for him to leave his country, he went into Poland and Transylvania. When this happened cannot be precisely determined; but it is certain, from a letter of Faustus Socinus, addressed to him March 14th, 1593, that he was then settled in the capital of Transylvania, and that he had previously been at Cracow, and returned to his native country. He was still at Clausenburg in the autumn of 1596; but whether in any public capacity or not, is altogether uncertain.

He held some peculiar notions about the speedy restoration of all things; and seems to have been anxious to interest Socinus in his speculations on that subject. But Socinus, with characteristic prudence and good sense, says in reply, that he does not possess sufficient skill in such prophetic questions to be able to instruct others, and has always been of opinion, that it is not necessary for a Christian man to inquire diligently, *within how many years*, and much less *in what year*, or even *whether early or late*, the predictions contained in Scripture ought to be fulfilled. He adds, that he shall be glad to learn, either from his correspondent or others, anything relating to Christian duty; and that it forms, in his opinion, no part of the duty of a Christian to know, whether the restoration of all

things will take place at an early, or a remote period; and that all which we have to do with it, as followers of Christ, is to be prepared for it, whenever it may come.

About the year 1597, Spangenberg returned from Transylvania into Poland, and settled at Racow, where he probably spent the remainder of his life.

In 1598, he sent another of his prophetic interpretations, on the two beasts in the Apocalypse, to Socinus, who, at the request of the Brethren, wrote some remarks upon it. But not content with this, he troubled Socinus again, who, on the 11th of August, 1601, wrote him a long reply, in which he endeavoured to shew the fallacy of his interpretations; and to convince him, that such speculations were mere solemn trifling. Spangenberg, who does not appear to have been ever made sensible of his errors on this subject, continued to live at Racow many years after this; and dragged on his existence in a state of the most abject poverty, till death put a period to his sufferings, on the 30th of August, 1620. There is a simple record of his death in Smalcus's Diary, unaccompanied by any other remark, than that he lived till he had attained the age of sixty-nine. From the heads of a letter in German, addressed to a Polish Unitarian lady, the autograph of which Sandius saw in Holland, in the year 1682, it appears that Spangenberg was excommunicated by the Polish Brethren; but the charge exhibited against him is not specified. The date of this letter was May 18th, 1610; and the contents were said to be as follow. 1. His own confession, and that of the Polish Brethren, on the humanity and divinity of Christ, and on his sacerdotal and royal office. 2. His confession concerning the excellence of Christ, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God his Father. 3. Reasons why he was excommunicated by the Polish Brethren, with his apology. 4. Who his accusers were. 5. On the

matter of his excommunication. 6. A brief account of a paper, which he drew up twelve years before the writing of this letter, containing some "Assertions concerning the Church of Rome," and the time in which we live. 7. His lamentation over the miserable state of the Church of the Polish Brethren.

In addition to the writings incidentally mentioned above, Spangenberg left behind him,

1. Theses concerning the Destruction of the Church of Rome, and

2. A Paper containing an account of Erasmus Johannis.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 88, 89. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 903—907. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. pp. 477—483. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinianismi Altorf. p. 246, Not. c. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1620, p. 1214, apud *Zeltn.*

114.

FABIUS GENGA was an Italian, belonging to the party of Faustus Socinus, as Faustus himself testifies, in a letter written at Cracow, March 14th, 1593, and addressed to Everhard Spangenberg. From this letter we learn that he was then living chiefly in Transylvania.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 369. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 477.

115.

JOHN BALCEROVICIUS was a citizen of Lublin, and Elder of the Church of that place, from the year 1580 to 1594, and probably later. He is mentioned by Faustus Socinus, in his correspondence with John Niemojevius and Martin Czechovicus; and there are still in existence no fewer than twelve letters addressed to him by Faustus, relating to the distribution of copies of his works, the controversies in which he was engaged, and other familiar matters. Bock learnt from Paul Crellius, that, by the authority of the Synod of Chmielnik, Balcerovicus undertook a deli-

cate mission, with Andrew Lubieniecius, to Goslar, to serve the mother and sisters of Christopher Ostorod, whom they were the means of rescuing from prison, and conducting in safety to the Brethren in Poland.

VIDEND. *Art.* 125. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant. T. I.* p. 43. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I.* pp. 424—428.

116.

NICHOLAS BERNAUD was a French Physician, of the province of Dauphiny. His name is twice mentioned by Faustus Socinus in a letter addressed to John Balcerovicius, and dated Nov. 21st, 1587; but is incorrectly printed “Bernardus,” instead of *Bernaudus*. This error of the press has led Bock to call him “Bernardus.” (*Bibl. Fratr. Pol. T. I.* p. 426. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant. T. I.* p. 45.) Faustus mentions him again in a letter to Valentine Radecius, with whose father, Matthew Radecius, he was connected by marriage. (*Bibl. Fratr. Pol. ubi sup.*, and p. 492.) In this letter, written in 1603, Faustus enclosed one, which he had received from Bernaud, containing a prescription for Christopher Ostorod. Dr. Bernaud translated into French F. Socinus’s treatise, “*De Auctoritate S. Scripturæ*,” and Faustus dedicated to him the Defence of his Disputation concerning the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. In this Dedication he applies to him the epithets, “*Medicum ac Philosophum eximium*.”

Matthew Radecius, in a letter written June 18th, 1598, requests Cornelius Daems to communicate to Dr. Bernaud an account of Faustus Socinus’s expulsion from Cracow, which had recently taken place, and which he had described to his correspondent with much minuteness in the former part of his letter.

VIDEND. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I.* locc. citt. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant. T. I.* p. 45. *T. Crenii Animadv. Philol. Hist. T. IV.* p. 242.

117.

JOHN BAPTIST BOVIUS was a native of Bologna, and an early and intimate friend of Faustus Socinus. He was an only son, and, had he been possessed of more worldly prudence, would have inherited a large property from his father, who was rich, and of a noble family; but having found it necessary to leave Italy about the year 1565, he became an exile and a wanderer. His father, though willing to assist him, was so strictly watched, that he could make him no remittances, without being regarded as an abettor of his heresy; and when his resources were exhausted, he was compelled to beg his bread, and reduced to a state of complete destitution. He resided for some time at Dantzic, but was ill treated by the Mennonites of that place. We learn, from a letter, addressed by Faustus Socinus to John Balcerovicius, and dated Sept. 28th, 1584, that Bovius, who was then living at Dantzic, and whom Faustus calls his "old friend," was an Antitrinitarian; but that he did not agree in all points with the Polish Unitarians. In what the difference consisted is not known. Bock, who was desirous of further information on this subject, applied to Paul Crellius in the year 1746, but could learn nothing from him, as to the history, or religious profession of Bovius, except that a friendship had long subsisted between him and Faustus Socinus. Bovius, however, was unwilling to take up his residence for the winter of 1584 at Lublin, till he had ascertained from Faustus, that he was likely to meet with a more favourable reception among the Unitarian Brethren of that place, than he had found among the Mennonites of Dantzic. Faustus assured him that he need be under no apprehension on that point; and wrote accordingly to his friend Balcerovicius, for the purpose of ensuring him the rites of hospitality. "I told him," says Faustus, "to be of good courage; for

that persons of our persuasion were nowhere disposed to turn their backs upon any one. Nay, I promised him, that at Lublin he would experience nothing but humanity and kindness." Nor was this the only friendly act of Socinus towards him; for at his suggestion, Dr. Philip Buccella, a wealthy Unitarian, allowed him an annuity of fifty florins, which contributed, in some degree, to lighten the burden of his extreme poverty. The period of his death is not known; nor has it been clearly ascertained whether he ever published anything. But it is not improbable, that he was the author of a small work, which was printed at Venice in the year in which he left Italy, and which bore the following title. "Jo. Bapt. Bovii, Juris Consulti Regiens. de statutaria Urbis Præscriptione, Tractatus, nunc primum in Lucem editus, cum Privilegio. Venetiis, apud Marcum Amadorum Bibliopolam Romanum, 1565," 8vo.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 71; T. II. p. 754. Hist. Socinianismi Prussici, § vii. p. 16. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 426.

118.

Dr. PHILIP BUCCELLA, the individual mentioned in the preceding article, as the patron of John Baptist Bovius, was related to John Baptist Cettis, and an intimate friend of Faustus Socinus, who, in his third letter to Matthew Radecius, acknowledges him his debtor in many ways. Socinus had known him from his youth, and loved and honoured him for his great talents, and diversified attainments.

Buccella maintained against his friend Socinus, both in conversation and by letter, the paradoxical position, that there is no sin really worthy of blame in human actions. His letter on this subject was addressed to Socinus on the 1st of Sept., 1583; and Socinus's reply, which was written from Paulikovice, is printed with the rest of his published

correspondence. In this reply he says, "It is now about eleven years since I first seriously turned my attention to this subject, and every day I have had such additional reason to be satisfied with my views respecting it, that I seem long to have expatiated in the clear light of truth; nor is there any point connected with this whole dispute, on which I have one lingering doubt. May this some time be your case!" (*Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 372.*)

Socinus regretted, that, amidst so many admirable qualities, Dr. Buccella seemed to have so little sense of true religion. The Doctor was a great admirer of Francis Pucci, but not so much on account of his piety and learning, as of a resemblance between Pucci and himself in their notions on the subject of religion. Neither of them would outwardly connect himself with any religious party; and the only difference between them in this respect was, that Pucci openly avowed himself a separatist from the Church of Rome, which Buccella appears not to have done, as late at least as the month of January, 1586. But from his patronage of Bovius, and his great kindness towards Faustus Socinus, it may be inferred, that, though indifferent to the outward forms of religion, he was no stranger to its true spirit. When Socinus lost his wife, and was without any establishment of his own, Buccella received and entertained him at Cracow; and he remained an inmate in the house of Buccella, without the slightest pecuniary acknowledgment, from the year 1592 to 1597. He then went into the lodgings which he had occupied during his former residence at Cracow, but was doubtful, as he expressed himself in a letter to John Volkelius, written March 8th, 1597, whether he should remain there, or again become the guest of Buccella, who strongly urged him to return to his house. From certain expressions in a letter addressed by Socinus to Andrew Voidovius, August 9th, 1595, it

may be inferred, that, among other splendid acts of liberality, Buccella had offered to contribute towards an edition of the writings of Socinus; and that Socinus then reckoned him among the “pious members of the Unitarian Church.”

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 79, 80; T. II. p. 686. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 368—372. 378. 473.

119.

PHILIP ADAUCTUS ZAKRZEVIUS, (*Polon.* FILIPA ZBOZY ZAKRZEWSKI,) was an Antitrinitarian of the school of Simon Budnæus; but had a brother, Luke Zakrzevius, who entered the Jesuitical College at Rome. When Socinus had been an inmate in the house of Dr. Buccella more than two years, Philip Zakrzevius made him an offer of assistance through Andrew Voidovius, which he declined, alleging that, from the time of his becoming the guest of Buccella, he had never felt the want of anything necessary to his comfortable subsistence. In the month of August, 1595, Socinus was expecting to see him at an approaching Church Meeting to be held at Luclavice; but though he professed to look forward to the interview with pleasure, and expressed gratitude for Zakrzevius's contemplated liberality, he refused to accept aid in any other form, than as a contribution to the publication of his collected writings.

The works of Zakrzevius, which were all in the Polish language, and filled a 4to. Vol. of sixty-four pages, were as follow.

1. An Answer to the Apology, or Assertions of the New College of Posnania concerning the Triune God;
2. Two Letters addressed to his Brother, Luke Zakrzevius;
3. A Lament over his Brother's fatal Apostasy;
4. A Prayer;

5. An Epitaph on his three Sons, Simeon, Adam and Paul, who died within a short time of each other, and were buried in the same spot; and

6. A Poem, entitled, The Morning Star.

VIDEND. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant.* T. I. pp. 1039—1044; T. II. p. 686. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 473.

120.

GEORGE CRATZER was the author of a German Catechism, the sentiments of which are represented as Photinian by Wolfgang Franzius, who quotes it, in his Fourth Disputation on the Augustan Confession; and says, that it was published at Clausenburg, in Transylvania, A. D. 1582. It is not mentioned by Vogt or Walchius; and Bock found no notice either of the author, or the Catechism, in the Manuscript Acts of the Church.

VIDEND. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant.* T. I. p. 116. *Wolfg. Franzii Disp.* in *August. Conf. Disp.* iv. § 71.

121.

ANDREW LUBIENIECIUS, (*Polon.* LUBIENIETZKI, or LUBIENIECKI,) a Polish Knight, was the son of Stanislaus Lubieniecus; and is said, by Polish writers, to have been related to the royal family of the Leszczynskis. Having relinquished his station at Court, he took a warm interest in the diffusion of Unitarianism, and devoted the rest of his life to its propagation. He sustained the office, first of a Synodical or General Deacon, and afterwards that of a Pastor among the Unitarians. He was one of the earliest of the Ministers at Smigel, but not the first, as some have supposed; for John Krotovius, or Grotkovius, was stationed there in 1580, and does not appear to have left till 1584. (*Vide Art.* 89.) Bock says, that Andrew Lubieniecus was called from Smigel, to preside over the ministry in the district of Lublin and Hoscia, (written *Hosia* by

Sandius, B. A. p. 89,) in the year 1592; and Smalcus, in his Diary, says, that in 1608 he succeeded Morscovius, the Junior Minister of *Hoystra*, which Zeltner supposes to be the same place as the *Hosia* of Sandius. (Hist. Crypto-Socinismi, Supplem. p. 1184, Not. b.) He lived upon his own property, and declined receiving any remuneration for his services, on which account he is not mentioned so often as he would otherwise have been, in the Church writings of the Socinians. He died at Siedliski, near Lublin, at the house of his son-in-law, Joachim Rupnovius, in the year 1623, at the age of seventy-one, or seventy-two; and left behind him the following manuscript works.

1. A Treatise on the Millenary Reign of Christ. In this Treatise he advocated the notion of an earthly Millennium, which he afterwards abandoned.

2. Commentaries on the Apocalypse of St. John in the Polish language.

3. Polono-Eutychia; also in Polish.

4. Chronicon, or a Description of the Kingdom of God, commencing with the Nativity of our King and Lord, Jesus Christ; also in Polish.

5. A Catalogue of Disputations, which the Unitarian Polish Brethren have held with their Opponents.

6. A Book containing the Acts and Decisions of the Synods, held from the Beginning of the Reformation in Poland. This was continued by his son-in-law, Joachim Rupnovius, and others; and considerable use was made of it by his great nephew, Stanislaus Lubieniecicus, the younger, in his "History of the Polish Reformation," and by Bock, in his "Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianorum."

7. Historical Observations on Matters worthy of Notice in the Business of Religion.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 89. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 438, 439. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1608, p. 1184.

122.

STANISLAÛS LUBIENIECIUS, (*Polon.* LUBIENIETZKI, or LUBIENIECKI,) was a Polish Knight, and brother of Andrew, whose junior he was by about seven years; and in imitation of whom, he relinquished the pleasures and attractions of a Court, and undertook the office of a Pastor among the Unitarians. In the year 1577, he was a Page at the Court of Stephen Bathory, King of Poland; and, while in that station, was converted to Unitarianism, by hearing a sermon of George Schomann, On the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. He was Minister successively at Troppau, Racow and Luclavice. In the Synod held at Lubelsk, A. D. 1612, he, together with some other Ministers and Members of the Church, sought a union with the Evangelical party; and he subscribed the proposals, sent in on this occasion, in the following manner. "Stanisl. Lubieniecki, Cœtus Luclavicensis Superintendens." He died in the year 1633, at the age of seventy-four, or seventy-five. The manuscript Synodical Acts mention a Sermon, which he delivered at the Synod of Racow in 1631, a year or two before his death. An account of his writings is subjoined.

1. Various Polish Songs. Among these was a spirited Ode, which was inserted in the Collection of Psalms and Hymns, used by the Polish Unitarians.

2. Spiritual Preservatives; in the Polish language.

3. The Precursor of the Last Judgment of the Lord.

4. A work in the Polish language, Against John Petricius. In this work, he says, "Christ obtained this advantage from his suffering and death, that he was presented by God with a happy immortality; in which respect he

was like us, who manifestly obtain the same advantage from his suffering and death, although Christ obtained it before us all."

5. A Catechism, or Brief Compendium of the Doctrine of the Polish Unitarian Church; usually attributed to his nephew of the same name, but probably written by himself.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 89, 90. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 441, 442.

123.

CHRISTOPHER LUBIENIECIUS, (*Polon.* LUBIENIETZKI, or LUBIENIECKI,) a Polish Knight, was the son-in-law of Erasmus Otvinovius, and brother of Andrew and Stanislaüs Lubieniecius, whose example he followed, in exchanging the character of a courtier for that of a Unitarian Minister. He preached first at Levartow, near Lublin; then at Lublin, where, in 1598, he succeeded Martin Czechowiecius, who was deposed, for exciting dissensions on the subject of Baptism; and afterwards at Racow, where he died, in the month of February, 1624. After his settlement at Lublin, Faustus Socinus congratulated him, in a letter, dated August 14th, 1598, in which he said, "When I have heard you, which not seldom happens, preaching and exhorting, and inciting your hearers to take heed to their eternal salvation, you have seemed to me to be just such a one as God has chosen, in this kingdom, among his principal instruments, for converting men, not averse from piety, to himself, and his Christ; and rescuing them from destruction." Socinus also admonished him of what it was incumbent upon him to do in that place, where there were many adversaries, possessed of learning, and thoroughly versed in all the arts of sophistry. After an interval of several years, he had Valentine Smalcus as a colleague, on which con-

dition alone he consented to remain at Lublin. His last settlement was at Racow. He left behind him

1. Manuscript Sermons; and

2. A Discourse, delivered, a short time before his death, to his own children, which was published at Racow, immediately after that event, from the notes of Jonas Schlichtingius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 90. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 439, 440. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 469. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1598, pp. 1169, 1170.

124.

STEPHEN BALIUS was a Polish Knight, who, like the Lubieniecii, and many other persons of distinction among his contemporaries, adopted Unitarian sentiments. He is not mentioned in the Acts of the Unitarian Church in Poland; but we learn from Sandius, that he composed Hymns on Scriptural Subjects.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 90. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 43.

125.

CHRISTOPHER OSTOROD was one of the most learned and active among the Socinian leaders; and is called, by Albert Graver, "homo pereruditus, ac artis disputandi optime gnarus." Zeltner describes him as the most rigid of all the followers of Socinus. The name by which he was familiarly known among his Socinian contemporaries, was *Paschasius*, or *Paschalodus*. The latter of these is a rude Greek compound, from Πάσχα, the Greek word for *Easter*, (in German *Oster*,) and ὁδός, *a way*.

He was born at Goslar. His father, Henning Ostorod, was Pastor, first of the Lutheran Church at Eimbeck; then of the Church of St. Cosmas and Damianus, at Goslar; and lastly, of St. Stephen's in the same town. His mother was the daughter of the former Pastor of St. Stephen's.

John Mich. Heineccius, in his "Antiquitates Goslarien-

ses," (pp. 518, seq.) has given a long account of Christopher Ostorod; of his conversion to Socinianism; and of a conversation which his mother, Catharine Ostorod, had with some Ministers of the Lutheran persuasion, taken chiefly from a manuscript, communicated to him by Justus a Dransfeld.

Ostorod's father is said to have augured ill concerning him to his wife, and to have foretold, that he would involve her in distress and danger, when he was himself in his grave. "Christoph, mein Sohn," said he, "ist ein Schalk, und will nicht folgen, wie die andern, und wird dich, liebe Catharina, wann ich nun einmal das Haupt lege, in grosse Noth und Fahr bringen."

While yet a boy at school, he gave proofs of singular ability; and when he grew up, he far outstripped all his fellows, of the same standing with himself. When sufficiently prepared for College, he went to the University of Königsberg, and matriculated on the 21st of January, 1581, during the Rectorship of Paul Von Stein; but was excused the payment of the usual fees, on the plea of poverty. On his return home, after having completed his education, he endeavoured to procure the situation of a Chorister; but failing in his efforts to obtain this, he left Goslar, and went into Pomerania. In this Duchy, he was appointed Master of a Lutheran School at Sluchow, on the confines of Poland, where he was brought into frequent contact with Socinians, and led to imbibe their sentiments. Books were lent him by the Antitrinitarians of Dantzic, which completed his conversion; and he was sent, by the Brethren in that city, as a delegate, with one Zyblicki, a Minister of Cujavia, to the Synod held at Chmielnik, in the month of September, 1585, where he delivered a Latin speech in the presence of the members, publicly professed himself a Unitarian, and was re-baptized.

On his return to Sluchow, he recommended Socinianism in every possible way; and entered into a discussion concerning it with the Ministers of the Church, and the inhabitants of the town. He was accordingly deprived of his situation as Schoolmaster, and found it necessary to leave the place. He went first to Dantzic, where Matthew Radecius confirmed him in his new opinions; and then to Goslar, his native town, where he converted his mother. On a second visit to Goslar, he sowed the seeds of Unitarianism among many of the inhabitants. The mother was no less zealous than the son: and the Magistrates, in order to prevent the matter from spreading further, determined to commit both to prison. Christopher, being apprized of their intention by his sisters, made his escape; but his mother was seized, and incarcerated. When she had been in confinement about a week, she feigned repentance; and on making a public recantation of her alleged errors, was set at liberty. Soon afterwards, however, she made it known, that her contrition was only assumed; and her son commended her for her constancy. The rest of the inhabitants, whose minds had been unsettled, returned into the bosom of the Lutheran Church; but the four sisters of Ostorod, and his brother John, remained true to the principles which they had embraced. The two brothers were present at the Synod of Chmielnik, in the month of September, 1586, where, after much discussion, it was determined, that Andrew Lubieniecius and John Balcerovicius should go as a deputation to Goslar, and intercede for the widow Ostorod, and her four daughters. The proposal emanated from Andrew Lubieniecius, who offered himself to undertake this delicate mission, and was seconded by John Balcerovicius, who volunteered to accompany him; and by their prudent management, the negotiation with the authorities at Goslar was brought to a successful issue.

The widow and her daughters were allowed to accompany their generous benefactors, on their return into Poland. The daughters were afterwards respectably married; and the mother found a comfortable home, first in the house of John Balcerovicius at Lublin, and subsequently under the hospitable roof of Andrew Lubieniecius, where she died. Christopher, and his brother John, received a cordial welcome, as members of the Church. The former learned the Polish language, during his residence with Andrew Lubieniecius at Racow, who liberally supplied him with food and clothing, and under whose direction he soon prepared himself for the office of a public religious instructor. The latter had the management of a School at Conitz entrusted to him. Christopher, after a short stay at Racow, was appointed one of the Masters of the School at Chmielnik, in which office he was succeeded by Peter Statorius, in the year 1587. He seems then to have visited the two brothers, Stanislaus and Christopher Lubieniecius, and afterwards to have settled at Smigel. From Smigel he removed to Buskow, near Dantzie, where he continued to exercise the pastoral office for many years. Whether he had settled with any other congregation than the one at Smigel, before his removal to Buskow, is uncertain. If he had, the fact was unknown to Sandius; but Lubieniecius, in his "*History of the Polish Reformation*," (p. 240,) represents him as the first Minister, who officiated in the Church at Racow, and evidently considers him as the immediate predecessor of Peter Statorius in that office.

During his residence at Buskow, he had a friendly Conference with James Fabricius, of which Faustus Socinus gives the following account, in a letter to Valentine Smalcus, dated August 31st, 1598. "I am greatly delighted at the issue of our Ostorod's dispute with that Fabricius, and expect that God will open the eyes of many, although

Voidovius, Ostorod's companion, writes to me in terms, which scarcely allow me to believe, that the end of that dispute was such as Ostorod himself describes it to me. The words of Voidovius are as follow. 'Our Ostorod has had a Conference with Dr. James Fabricius, a Theologian and Preacher, and the Conference will perhaps be resumed to-day after dinner. We parted on mutual good terms, and received no common divine blessing. This Doctor made mention of you: he had read your book *De Servatore*: he asks for your whole Body of Theology; and not he only, but many others also.'" (Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 461.) Smalcus records, in his Diary, that he himself had a conversation with this Fabricius on the principal disputed points of Christian doctrine, which lasted a whole day; and he seems to have thought, that Fabricius's mind was favourably impressed with the Unitarian doctrine. It does not appear, however, that he avowed himself a convert to it. Zeltner describes him as a very learned man, but remarkably devoted to the sentiments of the Calvinistic party; Rector of the Gymnasium of Dantzic; and the friend and colleague of the celebrated Bartholomew Keckermann.

On the 11th of July, 1598, Christopher Ostorod and Andrew Voidovius went together into Holland; and endeavoured to sow the seeds of Unitarianism in that free Republic. Heineccius says, that Ostorod undertook this journey, because a longer residence in Poland was not agreeable to him. But it appears, from the Preface to Schlichtingius's "Apology for the Truth," addressed to the authorities of Holland and West Friesland, that his motive was not a regard to his own personal convenience, but simply a desire of doing his duty, and conferring a benefit on his fellow-creatures. The immediate occasion of this journey, according to Sandius, was to visit certain

noble Polish youths, who were studying in the University of Leyden. Ostorod and Voidovius availed themselves of the opportunity, thus incidentally afforded them, of making their sentiments better known to the Dutch, whose attention had not been called to the Unitarian controversy since the flight of Erasmus Johannis, in 1584. During their stay at Leyden they effected the conversion of Ernest Sohner, who was then studying in the University of that city; and it has been said, that they imparted a bias in favour of Unitarianism to the mind of the celebrated James Arminius, who was at that time residing at Amsterdam. But be this as it may, their activity was such as to attract the attention of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities; and they were proscribed by a Public Decree. A copy of the Rescript of the Theological Faculty, dated August 12th, 1598, and a translation of the Ordinance of the States-General from the Dutch into the Latin, dated September 3rd in the same year, are transferred to the Appendix of the present work, from the second volume of Cloppenburg's Theological Writings.* In the former of these documents, it is stated, that the books dispersed by Ostorod and Voidovius, and submitted to the Theological Faculty for examination, differ but little from Mahometanism, and subvert the True and Eternal Deity of Christ, the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit; the office of Christ, and its salutary benefits; the institution of Baptism, and our religious duty towards Christ; inasmuch as they deny that he should be worshiped, and invoked as the Eternal God, and True Creator. The Dean and Faculty, therefore, express a hope, that the persons circulating such writings may not be permitted to remain long in the country; and that the writings themselves may not fall into the hands of any one, likely to be misled by them, through ignorance or curiosity.

* APPENDIX, No. vii.

In compliance with this recommendation, the States-General ordered, that the books should be burnt on the forenoon of September 4th; and that Christopher Ostorod and Andrew Voidovius should leave the United Provinces within ten days; and, if found, after that time, in those Provinces, that they should receive such punishment as the States should decree, in order to prevent others from following their example. Cloppenburg, on the authority of Uitenbogaerdt, adds, that, though proscribed by this Decree, they still remained in Friesland, where they carried through the press an Apology in reference to the aforesaid Decree, written in the month of August, 1599, and printed both in Latin and Dutch, in the month of February, 1600. It appears, however, from Smalcus's Diary, that Ostorod returned from Holland into Poland on the 29th of January, 1599; and Zeltner says, "*posteaquam aliquantisper adhuc Franequeræ latuerat cum socio Voidovio.*" Now it is extremely improbable, that Zeltner should have used the word "*aliquantisper*" to denote nearly a year and a half, or from August, 1598, to February, 1600. The difficulty can only be removed, by supposing, that Ostorod left Franeker about the beginning of the year 1599, and returned to it clandestinely in the course of the same year.

With regard to the effect of that part of the Decree, which enjoined the burning of the books, it is stated, that a pile was raised, that the executioner made his appearance, and that a crowd assembled, expecting to witness the conflagration; but that the books themselves had disappeared, in some strange and mysterious manner. "The Magistrates," says Mosheim, "who were curious to learn their contents, had quietly divided them among themselves."

The following is Brandt's account of the mission of Ostorod and Voidovius into Holland, and its results. "In the month of August [1598] there arrived in these parts

two men of the opinion of those that are commonly called *Socinians* by some, and *Unitarians* by others. One was Christopher Ostorod, a German; the other, Andrew Voidovius, a Pole. After they had rested themselves a few days at Amsterdam, the Burgomaster seized upon all their books and papers in the inn where they lay, and caused them to be brought to the Stadthouse. It was supposed that the books contained falsities and blasphemies, and that the owners of them endeavoured to innovate in religious matters. The men affirmed the contrary, and insisted that their books should be restored. But they were sent to Leyden, to be there perused and examined by the Professors of Divinity, who pronounced concerning them, that they contained heretical notions, and such as were near akin to the Mahometan doctrines. From thence the books were sent by the Magistrates of Leyden to the Committee of the States-General. The Professors all the while laboured underhand to get these men sent away as soon as possible. At last this resolution was taken: 'That the aforesaid books should be burnt in the presence of the owners, at the office of the Generality, on the 9th of September, and that the men should be warned to leave the United Netherlands in the space of ten days after, upon pain of being punished according to the pleasure of the state, and for an example to the like offenders.' At the appointed time the fire was prepared to burn the books; but neither did the owners appear, though summoned to see the execution, nor were the books committed to the flames, the Deputies and others sharing them among themselves out of curiosity. At the same time the States writ to all the Provinces, to beware of those two persons, Ostorod and Voidovius. However, they staid awhile in the country, and particularly in Friesland, where they drew up an Apology for themselves, and caused it to be privately

printed. In this writing, which was addressed to the States, we find a defence of their opinions against the judgment of the Professors, with a complaint, that ‘They, together with their books, were unjustly condemned, upon the judgment of three or four Divines, who have thus instructed you; they abuse your service. And it was by the same way (they thought) that the people were brought at last to the stake for their belief.’”

From the time that Ostorod was settled at Buskow, he was constantly engaged with his Brethren in disputes concerning War, Magistracy, Actions-at-Law, Oaths, the Possession of Riches, and similar subjects; always pushing his views to an extreme, and never disposed to make the slightest concession to those, who differed from him in opinion. He was also a strict and uncompromising advocate of ecclesiastical discipline, and urged the exclusion of unruly members from the Church; and he was so severe in his animadversions upon books, which had received the sanction of the whole Church, that it was at length determined, in the Synod of Lublin, held at Whitsuntide, A.D. 1610, and that of Racow, held October 3rd in the same year, that some of the Brethren should be deputed to inquire into his conduct, and apply a remedy. The Deputies sent on this occasion consisted of three laymen, and five Ministers. The laymen were James Sieminius, Jerome Moscorovius and Adam Goslavius; and the Ministers, John Volkelius, Andrew Voidovius, Valentine Smalcus, John Grotkovius and John Cpiliovius. They set out on their journey, October 12th; and were met at Dantzic, by Caspar Sack, — Trebiecki, Nicholas Hoffmann and others, in whose presence they entered upon the business of their mission. It appears, that Ostorod had taken offence, and had been led to entertain thoughts of withdrawing himself from the communion of the Socinians, because

Smalcius had said, that *the precepts of Christ and the Apostles were not all necessary to salvation*. For this hasty conduct he apologized in the presence of the assembled Brethren, and thus the matter ended. Smalcius, who gives an account of this unhappy dissension, in his Diary, states that Ostorod died at Dantzic, on the 8th of August, 1611; and calls him his chief friend, and father according to the faith, from whom he imbibed, during his ministry at Smigel, the first principles of Christian truth.

When allusion was made to his death, in the Synod, held at Racow in the month following, all agreed in describing him as a religious, pious and profoundly learned man; and one who had deserved well of the Church.

It appears, from his own letters, that he was a person of delicate constitution, and suffered much from protracted illness; and this may account, in some measure, for the impatience of his temper. He was a married man, and had a family; for the Manuscript Acts relate, that his son, Christopher, appeared at the Synod of Lublin in 1607. But no particulars concerning his wife and children have been placed upon record. Although he agreed generally with Socinus, who had a great regard for him, and a high opinion of his judgment, yet on some points he entertained doubts, and often wrote to Socinus for a solution of them. Smalcius says, "It was found, after the death of Ostorod, as I had often predicted to the Brethren, that he had endeavoured to enflame and irritate the little Church, over which he presided, consisting of mere country people, against all the Polish Churches;" and Zeltner hesitates not to say, that it was owing to the moroseness of his disposition, that he remained in the remote situation of Buskow till his death, and was not appointed to take the charge of a more numerous congregation. His works, published and unpublished, are fifteen in number; and two of these

he prepared in conjunction with Voidovius. The following are the titles of them, with such other particulars as are thought likely to interest the reader.

1. Bekenntniß von dem einigen Gott dem Vater, und von seinem Sohn unsern Herrn J. C., und von dem H. Geist, neben etlichen *Notis* oder Anmerkungen auf Casp. Schwenckfelds Bekenntniß von J. C. This Confession appears to have been written some time between 1589 and 1591.

2. A Dispute with Jerome Powodowski, Canon of Posnania, concerning the only God, that he is the Father alone; concerning Christ the Lord, the Son of God; and concerning Baptism, that it is proper for Believers, but not for Infants. This Dispute was held in 1592, at Smigel, and was published by Ostorod in the Polish language.

3. A Brief Compendium of the Doctrine of the Christian Church, now flourishing chiefly in Poland. This is one of the works, of which Ostorod and Voidovius are reported to have been joint authors; and it is also said to have been taken from them in the year 1598, and ordered to be publicly burnt in Holland. Another edition of it was published in 1630; and a third, with an answer by Cloppenburg, at Franeker, in 1652, 4to. Some have supposed that Conrad Vorstius was the author of this Compendium. A Dutch translation of it was published at the end of the Dutch version of Faustus Socinus's treatise, "*De Officio Hominis Christiani.*"

4. Annotations upon some of the more difficult Passages of Scripture. These were in manuscript, and were ordered to be committed to the flames on the same occasion as No. 3.

5. Unterrichtung von den vornehmstem Hauptpuncten der Christlichen Religion. Racow, 1604, 8vo. S. Sternacki. A second edition was published in 1612, a third in

1625, and a fourth in 1629. A Dutch translation of it in 4to. appeared in 1649. The many editions, through which it went, shew in what high estimation it was held by the Socinians; but it has ever been, and still is, a work of great rarity.

6. A Dispute of Christopher Ostorod with George Tradeln, on the Divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. This was in German, and without date; but was printed by Alexius Rodecki, and, as Wolfgang Franzius suspected, about the year 1598. It was reprinted by Sebastian Sternacki, at Racow, in 1625, 4to. Sandius says, that a manuscript copy of this work was taken from the author in Holland, by order of the Magistrate, in 1598.

7. An Apology in reference to the Decree of their High Mightinesses the States-General of the United Provinces of Holland, issued against Christopher Ostorod and Andrew Voidovius, Sept. 3rd, 1598, 4to. This Apology purports to have been written by Christopher Ostorod and Andrew Voidovius, in the month of August, 1599, and published in the month of Feb. 1600; but it is not said where.

8. On the Satisfaction of Christ. This seems to have been a reprint of the third part of No. 6.

9. Animadversions on Philosophy, as far as it has encroached on the Province of Theology. *MS.*

10. Metaphysics. *MS.*

11. A Letter to Nicholas Bernaud. *MS.* Nicholas Bernaud was a gentleman of Dauphiny, who translated Faustus Socinus's treatise "De Auctoritate S. Scripturæ" into French. (Vide *Art.* 116.)

12. A long Letter in German to the Brethren at Altorf, particularly G. L. Leuchsner and Nic. Leimer, in which Ostorod treats of the discipline of the Church, and the joint participation of the Lord's Supper with the Calvinists.

Zeltner has inserted this Letter at full length in his "Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf.," &c. (pp. 130—143.)

13. A Tract against the Herrnhutters, or Moravian Communists, who recommend and adopt a Community of Goods, and of whom frequent Mention is made in the Synodical Acts of the Unitarian Church in Poland. *MS.*

14. A small German work, On the Obedience of a Christian Man. That Ostorod composed a work of this kind we learn from a resolution of the Synod of Racow, under the year 1636, by which it was determined to publish a second edition of it.

15. Contributions towards a German Translation of the New Testament, which was printed at Racow in 1630.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 90—92. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 558—580. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 30—33. 281—286; Supplem. p. 1171, Not. b. *Smaleii* Diarium, A. D. 1598. 1599. 1603. 1610. 1611. 1612. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xii. p. 240. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. l. c. *Cloppenburgii* Opera Theol. T. II. pp. 332—335. 501. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. I. Bk. xvi. pp. 476, 477. *Mosh.* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § xiv. p. 719, etc.

126.

ANDREW VOIDOVIVS, (*Polon.* WOYDOWSKI,) was by birth a Pole, and either the son or the brother of John Voidovius, Pastor of Chmieln, who is mentioned in the Manuscript Acts, as having attended the forty-fifth Synod of Racow, in 1580. John Peltius, in the Dedication to his "Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum," incorrectly calls him *Vajodivus*, unless the name *Voidovius* in Dutch requires this transposition.

He flourished, according to Sandius, as early as the year 1583, but was then a young man. In the correspondence of Faustus Socinus, there is a letter of advice addressed to him by that eminent reformer, on the 18th of March in

that year, admonishing him not to spend too much of his time in the study of polite literature, to which he was then much devoted; and not to make it the main pursuit of his life, but to choose some of the higher branches of study. We learn from the same letter, that he had been educated from his infancy in true piety, and was then engaged in tuition; and Zeltner conjectures, that his pupils were the sons either of Paulicovius, or of Buccella, the benefactor of Socinus.

It appears, from the fragment of another letter, addressed to him by Socinus, April 25th, 1590, that he was then at Wittenberg. It was there that he first became known to Valentine Smalcus, who, in the year following, contracted a close intimacy with him at the University of Strasburg, and made a confirmed Socinian of him. During his residence at Strasburg he held the office of private tutor to Zachariah Krokier, probably some relation of Paul Krokier, who was Rector of the Gymnasium at Racow, from 1613 to 1616. (Vide *Art.* 178).

In 1595, some time after he had returned to Poland, he was meditating another tour into Germany: for on the 9th of August in that year Socinus thus writes to him. "I quite approve of your intention of making some stay in Germany, provided only you are sure that it will not be necessary for you, when there, either to conceal or dissemble your opinions, beyond what your allegiance to God demands. For I see, that, in other respects, you will be more useful to the Church of God there, than in Poland. This subject might be brought forward at the meeting at Luclavice, where I hope to be present."

In 1597, he took some young Polish gentlemen to Leyden, who were desirous of prosecuting their studies in the University of that city; and went to visit them the next year, in company with Christopher Ostorod. During this

visit, some books which they had with them were seized, and ordered to be publicly burnt; and they were commanded forthwith to leave the Dutch territory. (*Vide Art.* 125.) About this time, Voidovius became intimate with Ernest Sohner, whom he calls “ornatissimus Dnus. Ernestus Sonerus, artium et philosophiæ Magister, studiosus pietatis, amicus honorandus;” and in whose conversion to Unitarianism, it has been said that he was mainly instrumental. George Hornius, after mentioning the journey of Ostorod and Voidovius into Holland, says, that books inculcating Socinianism began, from that time, to be secretly imported, and put into circulation by Conrad Vorstius, James Arminius, and others; and he adds, in a note, that Arminius, in the course of a conversation with Ostorod and Voidovius, praised the acumen and erudition which they displayed, and said that they afforded much matter for attentive consideration.* Nor can it be doubted, that a spirit of inquiry was thus excited, which led to a very extensive adoption of the Socinian doctrines among the leaders of the Remonstrant party. It was not more than twenty years after the expulsion of Ostorod and Voidovius from the Low Countries, that the Deputies, from Guelderland to the Synod of Dort, proposed to prohibit the importation of the books of Ariens and Samosatensians.

Voidovius, during his journeys into foreign lands, displayed great anxiety to make converts; and particularly among the youths, who were studying at the Universities. This proselyting spirit sometimes exposed him to great personal hazard. The students in the Jesuitical College at Cracow, on one occasion, caught and beat him; then plunged him into a river, and stripped him of all his clothes. This, happening on the 20th of January, 1611, in the very depth of winter, nearly occasioned his death. Zeltner,

* APPENDIX, No. viii.

however, remarks, that practices of this kind were very frequent at Cracow; and that other "Dissidents," as they were called, besides Antitrinitarians, were made the victims at such times. Socinus, in a letter to Voidovius, written Oct. 7th, 1594, mentions an instance of an indignity offered to himself in the streets of Cracow, when his face was smeared, and his mouth filled with mud, by order of a Polish Knight, named Wiernik, who charged him with being an Arian, and with having undermined the religious principles of his father.

Voidovius was a Pastor, first at Lublin, and afterwards at Racow. That he was married at the time of his journey into Holland appears from the correspondence of Socinus. His wife, who was the daughter of Matthew Radecius, died on the 15th of Sept., 1621. We collect, from the Second Century of Ruarus's Epistles, that Voidovius was living in 1619; and from the manner in which Smalcus notices the death of his wife, it may be presumed that Voidovius survived her. It seems probable, indeed, from a Dissertation on the Apocalyptic Visions, which Sandius attributes to Voidovius, and which was published at Clausenburg, under the feigned name of Robert Janson, of Campen, in 1625, that he was living in that year. He wrote

1. His Opinion concerning God and Christ, and some other Matters pertaining to the Christian Religion, at the request of a certain friend in Holland, which is referred to in the Apology to the States of the United Netherlands, drawn up by Ostorod and himself in 1599; and

2. Notes on Peter Hyperphrogenus's History of the Death of Michael Servetus. Both these remained in manuscript.

- 3, 4. He was also concerned with Ostorod in the composition of two works, of which an account has already been given in the preceding Article, under Nos. 3 and 7.

5. That he was the author of the little work referred to above, and entitled, "A Short Dissertation on the Visions described in the 13th and 17th Chapters of the Apocalypse, by Robert Janson, of Campen," 8vo., has been affirmed by Sandius (B. A. p. 92); and Boeck observes, that in his own copy of this work, a former possessor of it, whom he supposes to have been Michael Gittichius, had made a similar remark in the title-page.

6. But the composition, on which Voidovius appears to have bestowed most labour, bore the title, "Elenchus Locorum Scripturæ S. Vet. et N. T. quæ pro asserenda SS. Trinitate et æterna Filii Dei Deitate adferuntur, per contrarias Patrum et Doctorum tam Romanæ, quam Augustanæ et Reformatæ Ecclesiæ Interpretationes." Sandius supposes this to have been the same work as the one, entitled, "Andree Voidovii Triadomachia, in qua ex variis Auctoribus Trinitariorum, et eorum Interpretationibus Locorum S. Scripturæ in Speciem huic Errori faventium, verum Sensum et Interpretationem collegit." He is further of opinion, that it was the same with that, which is elsewhere called, "Sylloge Locorum de Trinitate." These conjectures of Sandius approve themselves to Boeck, who further suggests, whether this may not also have been the work, to which the adversaries of the Socinians gave the title, "Tormentum Throno deturbans," &c.; and which they said was in the press, when the Socinians were expelled from Racow. Nor is it improbable, that this title was prefixed to the book, which they afterwards called "Triadomachia," a title which frequently occurs in the Manuscript Acts of the Polish Unitarian Church. They seem, however, at a subsequent period, to have softened down this title; and in the place of "Triadomachia," mention is made of Voidovius's "Elenchus," "Sylloge," and "Syntagma," in the completion of which many assisted,

(vide *Art.* 195, ad calcem; *Art.* 238, No. 9,) and which, in process of time, seems either wholly, or in part, to have disappeared. Hence, in the year 1654, at the Assembly of Czarcow, Ruarus was requested to make diligent inquiry, where Voidovius's book lay concealed, and, when found, to get it printed. In 1655, at the Assembly of Racow, Ruarus and Crellius were enjoined to search after this writing in Holland, among the heirs of Conrad Vorstius. It seems also to have turned up somewhere; for in the Assembly of Kreutzburg, A. D. 1668, Stanislaüs Lubieniecious, the younger, was invited to carry on to a state of completion, the "*Syntagma Locorum S. Scripturæ de Trinitate*," begun by Andrew Voidovius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 92. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 986—992. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. pp. 469—473. *Smalcii* *Diarium*, A. D. 1591. 1592. 1610. 1611. 1612. *Hornii* Hist. *Eccles.* p. 523. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. III. Bk. xxxiii. p. 39. *Allwoerden*, Hist. Mich. Serveti, Proëm. p. ii. etc.

127.

BONFINIUS is mentioned by Peltius, in the Dedication to his "*Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum*," in connexion with Smalcus, Ostorod, Voidovius, and others, as one of the clandestine followers of Socinus. Peltius refers to Pareus in proof of the harmony subsisting between the Socinians and Remonstrants; and with that view quotes the following passage from a letter, addressed by the learned Professor to N. N., March 1st, 1613. "The Socinians in Poland a short time ago expressly called *your* Arminius *theirs*, together with one Bonfinius and Acontius, clandestine disciples, by whose authority they sought a union with the Orthodox Brethren: but the Orthodox firmly rejected the proposal. The Synod of Lublin sent an account of its proceedings to me, to which I replied the day after last Christmas-day." The Synod of Lublin

here referred to was held in the year 1612, when an attempt was made to bring about a union between the Socinian and the Reformed parties, on condition that each should retain its distinguishing opinions, but at the same time that they should act together, and mutually tolerate each other. But the Reformed, “*adhuc reformandi*,” to use the words of Andrew Wissowatius, rejected the proposal, saying, that no union could be effected, as long as the other party retained opinions adverse to their own, concerning the Trinity, the Satisfaction of Christ, the mode of Justification, and Baptism. The Reformed party afterwards published a pamphlet in the Polish language, entitled, “*Fire and Water*,” which was answered by Valentine Smalcus. About the same time, similar proposals appear to have been made, but with no better success, to the Mennonites.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 66. *Joan. Peltii* Harmonia Remonstrantium et Socinianorum. Lugd. Bat. 1633, 4to. Dedicatio, * * 2. *And. Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 215.

128.

PETER STATORIUS, (*Polon.* STOIENSKI, or STOINSKI,) Junior, was born about the year 1565. He was the son of Peter Statorius, of Thionville, (*vide Art. 50*), and married the daughter of Gregory Pauli. In 1588, at the early age of twenty-two, he was appointed Pastor of the Church at Luclavice; and after residing there for some time was stationed at Racow, where he soon became very popular. Though much younger than Faustus Socinus, he is known to have been, for many years, the companion of that illustrious man's life and labours. Nor did he long survive his friend; for Socinus's death took place March 3rd, 1604, and Statorius, who delivered a funeral oration for him, died May 9th, 1605, before he had completed the fortieth year of his age. Smalcus records, in his Diary, that Chris-

topher Brockayus, Rector of the School, or College, at Racow, died on the 15th of the same month; that they were interred on the same day; and that the funeral service for both was conducted by himself.

Many writers, among whom is Calovius, Professor of Divinity in the University of Rostock, have confounded the younger with the elder Peter Statorius. This error was pointed out to Calovius himself by Ruarus, in the forty-seventh of his First Century of Epistles.

The subject of the present article was engaged in various controversies, and is styled, by the anonymous author of the "Life of Andrew Wissowatius," appended, with some other small pieces, to Sandius's "*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*," (p. 228,) "*strenuus ille veritatis, (cui et in medio Turcarum, in ipsa Byzantina arce, haud veritus est præbere testimonium,) propugnator propagatorque.*" In this description there may be some slight exaggeration, as Statorius went to Turkey in the suite of the Polish Ambassador: but still it was thought, by his friends, that he incurred no small degree of danger, during his residence at the Porte. Of this, ample testimony is afforded by the following extract from a letter, addressed by Faustus Socinus to John Volkelius, Nov. 16th, 1596. "We are all in great anxiety at the absence of our Statorius. Would that he were safe among us again! For there are flying rumours of the death of Ostrowski, the King's Ambassador to the Turk, in whose train he went out. But we hope these rumours are false. I cease not to entreat God, that he would console us by the return of both to their friends." The reports, to which Socinus alludes, proved unfounded; for both the Ambassador and Statorius returned in safety, as Socinus, with great delight, announces in another letter to the same correspondent, written March 8th, 1597.

How dear to Socinus Statorius was after this, appears

from his own correspondence; and particularly from a letter, which he addressed to Christopher Ostorod, Feb. 17th, 1602, and from another addressed to Valentine Radecius, Nov. 23rd, 1603, a few months before his own death. The anonymous author of the "Life of Andrew Wissowatius," already referred to, describes Statorius as "the mouth-piece, and inseparable companion" of Socinus (*Ibid.*); and Francis Cheynell, speaking of Socinus, says, "he was so wise as to strike in with the Nobles, and the Courtiers, with the most youthfull and sharp-witted Pastors, and not only with subtile disputants, but smooth Popular Oratours, men more able to corrupt the people, witnesse Peter Steinius, or Statorius, by whose unhappy eloquence the sublimest subtilties of Socinus which transcended vulgar capacities, were so explained and smoothed in a popular, but plausible way, that the most refined notions were made familiar to the common people."

Statorius was associated with Socinus, in preparing for publication a Catechism, intended to exhibit a summary view of the doctrinal sentiments of the Polish Socinians; but they were both arrested by the hand of death in the midst of their labours, and the work was transferred to Valentine Smalcus and Jerome Moscorovius, who, with the assistance, real or nominal, of John Volkelius, succeeded in bringing it to a state of completion. (*Vide Art. 153, No. 52.*) Smalcus alludes to this circumstance in his Diary, under April 25th, 1605. On that day, as he informs us, he himself, Statorius, Moscorovius and Volkelius, began to compose a Catechism; but the very next entry in his Diary is a record of the death of Statorius, which took place within fourteen days of the above date.

The following are the works of Statorius.

1. A Conference or Disputation held at Luclavice with Farnovius in 1591, on the Existence of Christ the Lord

before his Mother. This Conference was in Polish; and we are told, by Daniel Clementinus, who quotes from it, that Statorius interpreted John viii. 58 in the following manner. "Before Abraham shall be that, which the name *Abraham* denotes, namely, the father of many believing nations, I, Jesus, am already the Christ."

2. A Disputation held during two days, at Lublin, in 1592, with Adrian Radziminski, and other Jesuits, in their own Church, and in the Presence of the Judges of the Supreme Tribunal of the Kingdom of Poland. This Disputation was also in Polish; but another account of it was published by the Jesuitical party.

3. A Confession delivered at the Synod of Lublin, in 1593. Sandius places this in his list of Anonymous Writings (B. A. p. 174); but Bock claims it for Statorius. (Hist. Ant. T. I. P. ii. p. 924.)

4. A Conference with Farnovius and Wisnovius, on the Existence of Christ the Lord before his Mother, held in 1593. *MS. Polon.*

5. A Disputation held on the 12th of Dec., 1593, with John Petricius.

6. A Translation of Faustus Socinus's "Reply to Wujek" into Polish. 1592, 4to. A second edition in 8vo. appeared in 1593.

7. A Defence of F. Socinus "On the Nature and Mode of our Salvation," drawn up in reply to a work of Gregory Zarnovecius, entitled, "Apocatastasis." *Polon.* This Defence was held in high estimation by the Socinians, as may be inferred from the fact, that at the Assembly of Czarcow in 1654, Ciachovius was requested to render it into Latin.

8. An Exhortation to Evangelical Ministers on a proposed Union with recently baptized Ministers, &c. *Polon.*

9. Reply to a Book of Martin Smiglecius, in which he has endeavoured to prove the eternal Deity of Jesus Christ;

and for this Purpose has heaped together several monstrous Arguments. *Polon.* This Reply probably appeared in 1595 or 1596.

10. A Polish Version of F. Socinus's Proof, that Evangelical Persons, studious of perfect Piety, ought to join the recently baptized, &c. 1600, 4to.

11. Funeral Oration on the Death of F. Socinus, in the year 1604. *Polon. et Lat. MS.*

12. A Pasquinade. 1610. *Polon.*

13. Sermons on various Passages of Scripture ; particularly on a large Part of John's Gospel. *Polon. MS.*

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 92, 93. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 922—938. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1605. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 451. 492. *Epistola de Vita A. Wissowatii*, l. c. *Ruari* Epistolæ, Cent. i. N. 47. *Cheynell's* Rise, Growth and Danger of Socinianisme, Chap. ii. p. 23.

129.

JUSTUS DE PREZ, called JODOCUS by F. Socinus, (Fratr. Pol. T. I. p. 426,) is mentioned by Bock, in his "History of Prussian Socinianism," (§ vii. p. 17,) as living at Dantzic in the year 1584. That city also continued to be his place of residence in 1590. Little, however, is recorded of him. It appears, from a letter addressed by F. Socinus to Matthew Radecius, Jan. 8th, 1586, that the former was then contemplating a journey into Holland, and expecting to have Justus de Prez as his travelling companion as far as Dantzic ; and in another letter of F. Socinus to John Balcerovicius, dated Cracow, Oct. 23rd, 1590, he requests Balcerovicius to forward to John Volkelius a copy of his treatise "De Jesu Christo Servatore," of which Justus de Prez had taken charge, intending to pass through Lublin, on his way to Dantzic.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 647 ; T. II. p. 754. Hist. Socin. Pruss. l. c. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 379. 426.

130.

WERNER BÜTTEL is classed by Bock among Prussian Socinians. He is mentioned by Hartknoch, as one who had been converted to Socinianism; but whether through the instrumentality of Matthew Radecius, or not, is uncertain. It appears, that, in the year 1643, he had been fifty-nine years connected with the Socinian body, so that he must have joined it as early as the year 1584.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Socin. Pruss. § vii. p. 17.

131.

JOHN CAPER, Senior, after officiating as Pastor of the Evangelical Church of Meseritz for about twenty-eight years, changed his sentiments late in life, and went over to the Socinians. He was re-baptized in a pond at Smigel, on the last day of July, 1588; on which occasion Valerius Herberger, a popular Evangelical Minister, wrote some satirical verses. It is said, that Caper presided as Minister over the Socinian Church at Smigel, from the time of his conversion to that of his death; and that, in the year 1608 or 1609, he was drowned, by a company of horsemen, in a pond at that place,—probably the very pond, in which he had been immersed at his baptism twenty years before.

In the Acts of a Synod of Evangelical Ministers, held at Posnania in 1566, it is recorded, that Caper was removed from the ministerial office at Meseritz, on account of certain opinions, which he entertained concerning the Lord's Supper: but he does not appear, at that time, to have gone over to the Antitrinitarian party.

He published, in 1565, A Dialogue on the Lord's Supper between a Brandenburger and a Pole, in which he expressed his agreement on that subject with Zwingli. To this Dialogue Erasmus Gliczner published a reply, in which he

designates Caper, "Ecclesiarum Renascentium in Majori Polonia Inspector."

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 92, 93.

132.

CORNELIUS DAEMS was a learned Civilian, who studied in Italy, and took his Doctor's degree with honours; but afterwards relinquished the profession of the Law for the study of Divinity,—a change which, though made from choice, was not unattended with pecuniary loss. He was one of the most intimate friends of Faustus Socinus, who entrusted to him copies of many of his unpublished writings. Indeed, Socinus himself hesitates not to call him, particularly with regard to religion, the most confidential of all his friends. His words are, "amicus meus summus, et mihi in religione potissimum, omnium quos habeo conjunctissimus." He was born at Brussels; and lived for some time at Dantzic, on friendly terms with Matthew Radecius. But his usual place of residence was Gouda. In 1588, a short time before the revolution in the Magistracy of Utrecht, the Scout endeavoured to apprehend him at an inn in that city, on the ground of his being a favourer of Socinus and his doctrines; but he escaped with the loss of a bag full of papers, printed and manuscript,—probably the writings of Socinus above mentioned. These the Scout delivered to the Senate, who referred them to Helmichius and Uitenbogaerdt, two Ministers of the Reformed party, for the purpose of obtaining their opinion respecting them. But before Uitenbogaerdt, who, at the request of Helmichius, undertook to read them first, could give an account of them, the government underwent a change; and Daems found means, partly by a manœuvre, and partly by threats, with the assistance of two burghers, to get them out of Uitenbogaerdt's hands, who, for his own justification, and to avoid the suspicion of hav-

ing voluntarily parted with them, lost no time in letting the Burgomasters know what had taken place. One of the burghers, who had assisted in recovering the papers, told Uitenbogaerdt, that he wanted to bring Daems to the stake, and to eat roasted flesh, like Calvin.

VIDEND. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 378. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 237, 238; T. II. p. 754. Hist. Socin. Pruss. § viii. p. 17. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. I. p. 429, Bk. xv. A. D. 1588. *T. Crenii* Animadv. Philol. Hist. F. iv. pp. 233—242.

133.

JOHN CUTTEN was an Elder in the Reformed Church of Sandomir, in Little Poland; and author of twenty-eight "Articles," to which Faustus Socinus wrote a reply. The doctrinal views unfolded in these "Articles" were distinctly *Unitarian*. In some of them Socinus expressed his acquiescence; some he qualified; and from a few he withheld his assent. They are inserted, together with the reply of Socinus, in the 2nd Vol. of the "Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum."

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 217; T. II. pp. 789—794. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. II. pp. 453—455.

134.

GEORGE ENYEDI, (sometimes called ENNIEDIUS, ENYEDINUS or ENJEDINUS,) was a Transylvanian, of the town of Enyed or Engedin, situated on the river Maros, or Mærisch. He was Superintendent of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania, and Moderator of the Gymnasium of Clausenburg. In the former of these offices he succeeded Demetrius Hunyadi, (vide *Art.* 108,) and he filled both from the year 1592 till the period of his death, which took place in 1597, when he was in the very flower of his age.

Near the middle of the last century, while a sexton was digging a grave at Clausenburg, he found a brazen coffin-

plate, bearing the following inscription in letters of gold. "Hic sepultum jacet corpus eruditione, ingenii subtilitate et pietate Cl. Viri D. Georgii Enyedini, Superintendentis Ecclesiarum Unum Deum Patrem et Mediatorem Jesum profitentium, qui scholam per sexennium, ecclesias pariter sex annis, fideliter magno cum fructu administravit. Tandem colicâ passione correptus, anno ætatis suæ 42, extinctus est, A. D. 1597, die 24 Nov. horâ 4."

Enyedi was the author of a work, entitled, "Explicationes Locorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis Dogma stabiliri solet," published after his death, but without date. It went through two editions. The greater part of the first edition was publicly burnt in Transylvania; and it was interdicted through the whole of the German Empire. The second edition, as well as the first, is without date, or printer's name; but according to John Fabricius, it was printed at Groningen, A. D. 1670. It abounds in typographical errors, particularly in the Greek quotations. In this work, the author understands the phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ, John i. 1, to mean "at the commencement of John's office," or, "when Jesus began to teach, and work miracles;" and the following is the interpretation, which he gives of our Lord's words, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι, John viii. 58. "At this very time, since I am your Messiah, I am before Abraham, and therefore prior to him: for as long as Abraham is not the father of many nations, so long he is not Abraham. But he has at length become the father of many nations through the Messiah, and therefore is posterior to him." This work of Enyedi was translated into the Hungarian language by Matthew Torotszskai, and printed at Clausenburg, in 1619; and again in 1620.

Ruarus and Smalcus thought but little of Enyedi, as an interpreter of Scripture; and Samuel Crellius says, that,

“among later Unitarians he is held in no great estimation.” Bock has enumerated no fewer than six separate replies to his “Explicationes” by different writers; but he has overlooked a seventh, entitled, “Speculum Trinitatis,” and described by Lampe as “a learned book, opposed to the blasphemies of George Enyedinus, and printed in 1622, at Debreczin,” a town in Upper Hungary.

Scherzer has attributed to Enyedi a work, “On the Divinity of Christ;” and Zeltner quotes from a treatise of his, “On the Providence of God.” Enyedi is also said to have written, “An Explication of some Passages in the Racovian Catechism.” But he was dead before the Racovian Catechism was published. Some earlier Catechism, therefore, must be intended;—possibly that of George Cratzer. (Vide *Art.* 120.) He is said also to have written a Preface to the Racovian Version of the New Testament. But Sandius thinks that no such version ever existed. That writer professes his entire ignorance of any Racovian Version of the New Testament, except the Polish one of Smalcus, and the German one of Crellius and Stegmann, both of which were published after the death of Enyedi; the former having been printed at Racow in 12mo., in 1606 and 1620, and the latter at the same place in 8vo., 1630. But Sandius must have forgotten the previous version of the New Testament into the Polish, with Annotations, by Martin Czechovicus, which was printed in 4to., by Alexius Rodecki, at Racow, in 1577. Of this he had himself previously given an account, (*B. A.* p. 51,) merely remarking, that the fact of its being printed at Racow was not stated in the title-page. But he speaks of Enyedi as having first come into notice in 1587, which was ten years after the publication of Czechovicus’s version.

In the correspondence of Faustus Socinus, there is a letter dated Sept. 16th, 1596, and written from Cracow,

in which Socinus salutes Enyedi as a Christian Brother, and endeavours to solve certain doubts, which he had suggested, respecting the Invocation of Christ. It plainly appears, from the letter referred to, that this question had not been set at rest, by the controversy between Francis Davidis and Faustus Socinus: and it is a remarkable fact, that, after an interval of seventeen years, we should find the Superintendent of the Unitarians in Transylvania doubting, as Enyedi does, whether Socinus's opinion upon this subject is tenable; and Socinus, on the other hand, admitting, that the practice of invoking Christ is in itself indifferent, and therefore unnecessary, inasmuch as it is neither commanded, nor forbidden in Scripture.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 93, 94, et l. c. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. ENJEDIN. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 324—331; T. II. p. 763. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 483—486. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Altorf. pp. 99, 100. 208, 209. *Cloppenb.* Opera Theol. T. II. pp. 331, 332. Mon. Rep. Vol. XV. (1820) p. 194. *Fogt*, Catal. Libr. Rar. p. 258. *Lampe*, Hist. Eccles. Ref. in Hungaria et Transylvania, Anno 1620, p. 356.

135.

JOHN KOSA was the fourth Superintendent of the Unitarians of Transylvania; and succeeded George Enyedi in that office A. D. 1597. We are not in possession of any particulars, respecting the history of the Unitarian Church in that country, during his term of office; but it is evident, from what has been said under the preceding article, and from what we shall have occasion to say in the account of Joseph Domanovius, (vide *Art.* 136,) that the opinions of Davidis respecting the Invocation of Christ still found zealous advocates in Transylvania and Lithuania, in spite of the violence of Blandrata, and the introduction of a more orthodox Confession under Demetrius Hunyadi.

VIDEND. Mon. Rep. Vol. XV. (1820) p. 194.

136.

JOSEPH DOMANOVIVS, (*Polon.* DOMANOWSKI,) as we learn from the Diary of Smalcus, was one of the principal of those, who, in Lithuania, defended the opinion, that Christ ought not to be invoked in prayer. "On the 18th of June, 1600," says Smalcus, "I was sent into Lithuania, with Christopher Lubieniecius, my colleague, and Christopher Rudnecius, Minister of Surasia, to the Synod of Novogrodek, for the purpose of thoroughly rooting out that blasphemy, which had seized the minds of some, concerning the Non-invocation of Christ. One Domanowsky, the leader of these blasphemers, had been summoned, but did not appear. The Brethren, therefore, being then strengthened, we took our departure; and the disputation with those men was deferred to the year following." In the month of December of the same year, Smalcus says, "I was sent again, with my colleagues, into Lithuania, to bring the forementioned controversy to a close. The Domanowsky before mentioned declined the conference, and did not attend the Synod. After much protracted discussion, therefore, he was excommunicated, by universal consent. All the rest returned to their duty of their own accord, when they had heard our proofs concerning the Divinity of Christ." On the last words of this passage, "the Divinity of Christ," Zeltner adds, in a note, "*that* Divinity, namely, which is of the mere grace of a simple human being, and factitious, and to which genuine religious Invocation cannot be addressed." Bock thinks, that Domanovius relinquished his opinion on the subject of prayer to Christ, and was ultimately reconciled to the rest of the Socinian body, because he visited the Lithuanian Churches, in company with Smalcus and Christopher Rudnecius, in the month of October, 1609.

He committed to writing an account of the Disputation

concerning the Divinity of Christ, between Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, and John Licinius, at Novogrodek, January 25th, 1594, which was printed by Bolemowski. In another Disputation, held at Polotzk, in Lithuania, in the month of October, 1589, of which he also wrote an account, he is said to have asserted, that the soul perishes with the body. But it is probable, that he merely denied, that there is an intermediate state of consciousness between death and the resurrection.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 250, 251. *Smaleii* Diarium, A. D. 1600, apud *Zeltn.* pp. 1172, 1173 (Not. a).

137.

JOHN LICINIUS, a native of Namyslaw, or Namslav, in Prussian Silesia, was ordained to the ministry, and appointed Pastor of the Church of Novogrodek, in Lithuania, in the year 1593. Sandius says, that he was also Rector of the Schools of John Kiszka, Castellan of Wilna; and it was probably the circumstance of his holding this office, which led him to compose his "Aristotelian Scheme of Doctrines," which was edited by Faustus Socinus, and published in 1586, under the feigned name of "Gratianus Prosper." On the 25th of January, 1594, he held a Disputation concerning the Divinity of Christ, with Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, at Novogrodek, an account of which, on the part of the Unitarians, was published by Joseph Domanovins; and another, on the part of the Catholics, by Albert Zaionczkowski. When the Transylvanians, in 1601, wished for a Minister, who understood the German language, as a successor to Erasmus Johannis, the Synod of Lublin fixed upon John Licinius: but he either altogether declined accepting the appointment, or held it only for a short time, and resumed his ministerial duties at

Novogrodek, where he afterwards had Michael Gittichius for a colleague. (Vide *Art.* 168.) He was adjudged unworthy of his office by a decree of the Synod of Novogrodek in 1615; and the sentence was confirmed, in the following year, by the Synod of Racow; but for certain reasons, the execution of it was delayed for some time. There is no doubt, indeed, that he promised to amend his conduct, so that he was still retained in the ministerial office, and in the communion of the Church; for he was present at the Synod of Racow in 1621, and mention is made of him as a Brother, in the Acts of the Synods held at that time. In 1624, at the Synod of Racow, he gave an account of a loss, which he had sustained from some wanton persons at Slomin; and requested that his Postil might be restored to him. (Vide *infra*, No. 5.) At length, in 1630, the sentence long before pronounced against him by the visiters of the Churches in the district of Lublin, was carried into effect; and Licinius was removed from the ministerial office, as the Synodical Acts testify, for inebriety and general misconduct. In 1633, however, he was reconciled to his Church, and received back into it as a member; but the Synod resolved, that, in future, he should abstain from the discharge of his ministerial functions, lest, in the event of a lapse, greater scandal should arise. Faustus Socinus, in a letter to Smalcus, dated July 24th, 1599, describes Licinius as a learned man; and one, who was well skilled in theological writings, and disputations. He wrote

1. The Anatomy and Economy of a Christian Man, 1592; a German translation of which, as appears from the Synodical Acts, was prepared by John L. Wolzogenius.

2. A short Treatise concerning a Disputation held with the Jesuits at Wilna, 4to. This Disputation was probably that of the year 1599.

3. Catalysis, or Dissolution: against "The Spiritual Shield" of Gregory Zarnovecius. 1598.

4. The Aristotelian Scheme of Doctrines; illustrated by Theological Examples, for the Use of Christian Schools, by Gratianus Prosper. Losk, 1586, 8vo.

5. A Postil. *MS.*

6. An Admonition addressed to Evangelical Ministers, for the Purpose of bringing about a Reconciliation with the Anabaptist Ministers. This, and all his other published works, except "The Aristotelian Scheme of Doctrines," which was in Latin, were written in the Polish language.

Licinius also assisted Moscorovius and Smalcus in correcting the Polish Version of the New Testament, which was finished on the 19th of February, 1606, and published at Racow in 8vo. during the same year, and again in 12mo. A. D. 1620.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 94. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 431—436. 1038. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 461. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Altorf. p. 348, Not. b. *Smalcii* Diar. A. D. 1606, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1181. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. iv. p. 335.

138.

CHRISTOPHER RUDNICIUS, (*Polon.* RUDNICKI,) was Minister of Surasia about the year 1600. Smalcus, in his Diary, mentions the fact of his going along with himself and Christopher Lubieniecus into Lithuania, to attend the Synod of Novogrodek, for the purpose of rooting out the blasphemy of not invoking Christ, which had seized upon the minds of some of the Brethren in that country.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 736. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1600.

139.

ALBERT CALISSIUS, in the account of the Synod of

Chmielnik, held A. D. 1586, is called "Rector," at which time he probably had the management of the School at Chmielnik. At that Synod also he was admitted by baptism into the Socinian Church. It further appears, from the Synodical Acts, that he was Rector of the School of Luclavice in 1600, and of that of Levartow in 1601. Lubieniecus calls him an eminently learned man, of whose advice and assistance the great John Zamoski availed himself, in establishing the Academy at Zamoſki. He had a son, whose Christian name was *Andrew*; and whom Lubieniecus describes as a learned, eloquent, pious, and peculiarly hospitable man. In the Acts of the Synod of Lublin, held in 1590, Martin Calissius, who had previously been Minister at Wielitzka, is mentioned as Minister of Wengrow; but being deposed, he went over to the Evangelical party, and became a Minister in that connexion, at Novogrodek. Other individuals of the name of *Calissius* appear to have studied in the University of Königsberg. Albert Calissius wrote

1. The Arraignment of the Jesuits by a Polish Knight. 1590, 4to. A second edition was published in the same year; and a third in the year following. Some have attributed this work to Simon Stenius; but Andrew Zaluski expressly claims it for Albert Calissius. Four separate replies to it were published; one of which, by the Dutch Jesuit, John Lans, was entitled, "The first Speech of a certain Polish Noble in Defence of the Jesuitical Clergy, in reply to 'the Arraignment of the Jesuits by a' pretended 'Polish Knight.'"

2. The Mirror of the Jesuits, or the Ornaments and Flowers of "The First Speech," &c. 1590, 4to. This little work is an answer to that of the Jesuit, John Lans.

3. A Speech against the Jesuits, delivered in 1591, and printed in 1592. 4to. This was in German, and Bock

says, that it is not a separate work, but beyond all doubt a German translation of No. 1.

4. The School of Levartow restored. Racow, 1593, 4to. This extremely rare little volume is a series of letters, containing an account of the mode of instruction, adopted by the teachers in the School of Levartow.

Sandius mentions, under the name of *Albert Calissius*, a Disputation held at Levartow in 1592, with the Jesuit Radziminski. But though Albert Calissius was one of the parties engaged in this Disputation, the written account of it is said to have been drawn up by John Niemojewius.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 94. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 88—91. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xiii. pp. 254, 255.

140.

WOLFGANG SCHLICHTINGIUS, (*Germ.* SCHLICHTIG, or SCHLICHTING,) of BUKOWIEC, was the father of the celebrated Jonas Schlichtingius. The family originally came from Switzerland; and, on its first settlement in Poland, the name was written *Schlichtig auf Bauchwitz*, from *Bauchwitz*, the German name of the family estate, which, in Polish, is called *Bukowiec*. Sigismund Schlichtingius, of Starpel, the cousin of Wolfgang Schlichtingius of Bukowiec, attached himself to the Evangelico-Lutheran party; and in 1592 published “An Explanation of the Apostles’ Creed,” which he addressed to the Church at Smigel, and to which that Church published a reply in the year following. This reply was drawn up by Matthew Radecius, and was preceded by two Prefaces, one of which was written by Radecius himself, and the other by Wolfgang Schlichtingius, and addressed principally to his cousin Sigismund, and other relations. Lauterbach states, that Wolfgang Schlichtingius had four sons, John, Jonas, Elias and Vespasian; and that Jonas was the only one, who imbibed the religious

principles of his father. We learn from Bock, that, after the Polish exile, this family settled in Prussia; and that, as late as his own time, (1776,) a member of it,—Jonas Christopher Schlichtingius,—exercised the ministerial office among the Socinians, who remained on the confines of Poland.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 94, 95. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 703, 704. 763—765. 825.

141.

FABRITIUS PESTALOZZA was one of the last surviving followers of Camillus Siculus. (Vide Art. 10.) He had been absent from his country seventeen years, but was living, and at Chiavenna, as late as the month of October, 1595. Whether he renounced his Antitrinitarianism, or left the Grisons, or was in any way tolerated by them, appears to be doubtful. However this may be, we read no more of the Church of Chiavenna being disturbed by persons holding Antitrinitarian opinions after his time.

VIDEND. *De Porta*, Hist. Ref. Eccles. Rætic. T. I. L. ii. C. xxiii. p. 632.

142.

ELIAS ARCISSEVIUS, (*Polon.* ARCISZEWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, and Lord of Smigel. He was both Patron and Pastor of the Church assembling in that place, having succeeded Andrew Lubieniecius in the office of Pastor, in the year 1592. Lauterbach thinks that he purchased Smigel from Dudithius, its former possessor, when that eminent individual resigned his diplomatic appointments, and retired into private life. Ruarus, in a letter to Joachim Peuschel, written A.D. 1614, describes him as “a man not unlearned, but one whose other occupations had not left him much time for literary pursuits.” He was an intimate friend of Faustus Socinus, and an early convert to his opinions. It

was at the urgent request of Arcissevius, that Socinus, in the year 1594, published his work “De Jesu Christo Salvatore.” To that work he contributed a Preface, in which he earnestly exhorts all, who have undertaken the office of Christian Teachers, and the care of souls, to peruse it with candid and unprejudiced minds; and having proved all things, to exemplify the apostolic maxim, by holding fast that which is good. The correspondence of Socinus, inserted in the first volume of the “Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum,” contains two letters addressed to Arcissevius, on some of the most interesting moral and religious subjects of that day.

Arcissevius left two sons, who distinguished themselves in a military and naval capacity;—Elias, who was an officer in the Danish and Swedish armies, and Christopher, who had the command of the Dutch naval forces in the Brazils. (Vide *Art. 236, 237.*)

In the year 1628, when a very old man, he sent a manuscript of his own composition to the Synod, with a request that it might be printed; but his request was not complied with. The reason assigned was, the want of the requisite funds. The subject of this manuscript is not mentioned in the Synodical Acts.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 95. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 40, 41. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 17, p. 95. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 438, 439; T. II. p. 115.

143.

CHRISTOPHER MORSTINIUS, (*Polon.* MORSZTYN,) of Raciborsk, was Lord of Paulikovice, and Starost of Philipovia. In his jurisdiction the authority of the Socinians was as great as in any part of Poland. He was a person of considerable celebrity among his countrymen, and preëminently distinguished by the royal favour. His very enemies bear testimony to the excellence of his character; and the

Churches which he erected evince a zeal for the promotion of the divine glory. He was the founder of the Church at Philipovia, which flourished under his auspices, and numbered among its Pastors the celebrated John Volkelius. Andrew Wissowatius used to call Morstinius "the Senator of the Church of God." His family was a very old one, being derived from the Montsternii of Germany, who were distinguished for their long line of nobility, and settled in the Palatinate of Cracow. Paul Crellius drew out a genealogical table of this family, which came into the hands of Bock.

When Faustus Socinus was obliged to leave Cracow, on account of the excitement which his disputations and writings had produced, Christopher Morstinius took him under his protection, and kindly supported him, for more than three years, at his own seat, which was only a few miles from Cracow. Here he found a safe asylum; and his kind and generous benefactor afterwards gave him his daughter, Elizabeth, in marriage. In the correspondence of Socinus, there are five letters addressed to Christopher Morstinius, which, as Bock says, deserve to be read. The *first* was written during a Synod at Lublin, and is dated June 5th, 1593. In this Socinus tells Morstinius, that the whole of the preceding day had been occupied in discussing the End and Use of the Lord's Supper; and that the Synod, with only one dissentient voice, had come to the conclusion, that the sole object of this rite is the commemoration and preaching of the death of Christ. In the *second*, Socinus alludes to some ill usage which he had received from a person under the influence of intoxication, and gives a list of his own writings. In the *third* he endeavours to prove, that the command about not Eating Blood has no force in our time. In the *fourth* he treats on the subject of Usury, and shews that it is not prohibited in the Old or the New

Testament, but allowed under certain restrictions. In the *fifth* he resumes the subject of the third, and dwells more particularly upon the reason assigned by God for the prohibition respecting the Eating of Blood, Gen. ix. 4. The last four were written from Cracow, between the years 1595 and 1597.

After an interval of more than forty years, we find Morstinus taking as lively an interest as ever in the success of the Unitarian cause, and using his influence to shield its advocates from persecution. On the 1st of March, 1639, he addressed a letter to the Senate of Dantzic, interceding on behalf of Martin Ruarus, who had been threatened with banishment from that city, on account of his religion. This letter was signed by eleven Polish Nobles and Magnates besides himself, whose names are given by Sandius in his brief Memoir of Christopher Morstinus. The letter itself was inserted in the second Century of the Epistles of Ruarus, printed at Amsterdam, 1681, of which it forms the fifty-first.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 95, 96. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 159. 508, 509. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vit. And. Wissowatii, pp. 222. 229. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. pp. 455—458. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 51. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, Chap. i. p. 8.

144.

JOHN VOLKELIUS, (*Germ.* VOLKEL,) of the town of Grimma, in the Circle of Meissen, was known, among the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf, by the name of *Popilius*, or *Populæus*, which is a Latinized form of the German name VOLKEL. Of his history before he came into Poland, and joined the Socinians, no particulars are recorded; but Zeltner, more than a century ago, observed, that it would be worth the while of those, who were acquainted with the division of Saxony in which he was born, to institute an inquiry into the circumstances, which led him to connect

himself with the Socinian party. As yet nothing has been ascertained respecting his early history, beyond the mere fact, that he was one of the beneficiaries of the Elector of Saxony, and studied Theology at Wittenberg in 1578, into the Augustan College of which place he was received as an exhibitioner, on the twenty-first of September in that year. On account of his connexion with that seat of learning, he is sometimes called, in the Synodical Acts of the Socinians, “Magister Wittebergensis;” and Schomann, in his Will, designates him “Magister noster.” But whether he was admitted to his Master’s degree in the University of Wittenberg is uncertain.

Of his mental endowments, and his unwearied efforts to promote the interests of the Socinian Church, the six letters addressed to him by Faustus Socinus, in his printed correspondence, afford sufficient evidence. For some time, indeed, he was the amanuëns of Socinus, and regularly employed in writing from his dictation. By constant and familiar practice in this way, he became thoroughly acquainted with the mind of that great man, whose opinions he made his own, and embodied in his work “On true Religion,” which may be regarded as a compendium of the writings of Socinus.

In the year 1585, at the Synod of Chmielnik, as we read in the Manuscript Acts, Volkelius was admitted a full member of the Socinian Church, by re-baptism. By the authority of the same Synod, he was appointed Master of the School at Wengrow in the same year. For some time he performed the duties of this office, in conjunction with the charge of a congregation. We learn both from the Synodical Acts, and a letter written to him by Faustus Socinus in 1594, that he was first appointed Minister of the Church in Philipovia, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Subsequently, in the year 1610, he removed to the

Church of Reiovice; and in 1611, or 1612, to Smigel. But although his hearers at Smigel had the highest respect for him, which they testified at the Synod of Racow in 1612, yet in the month of May, 1613, he was excluded from the ministerial office, by a decree of Synod, for contumacy and insubordination; and suspended, till he should give undoubted proofs of his submission to the authority of the Synod. What his offence had been is not recorded; but in May, 1614, he was re-admitted to the discharge of his ministerial functions at the Synod of Racow, after having made a declaration of his submission and obedience.

He died at Smigel in 1618; and in the year following, at a Synod held on the 5th of May, the Church of that place requested, that a successor might be appointed.

The Synodical Acts afford evidence that Volkelius was married; for the members of his congregation at Smigel, in 1612, requested permission of the Synod of Racow, to bring his wife to Smigel. But she seems to have died before him, because no mention is made of any grant to his widow; and such grants to Ministers' widows were always particularly specified in the accounts of the Synod. He left a daughter, Catharine, to whom, at a Synod in 1621, two hundred and seventy-eight florins were granted as a dowry.

Volkelius was distinguished for his acuteness and eloquence. In his writings he is neat and elegant, and in almost all respects a follower of Faustus Socinus. He left behind him in manuscript some Common-places and Discourses, as well as his great work "On true Religion;" and he assisted, though slightly, in completing the Racovian Catechism, and illustrated it with notes. His published works are as follow.

1. The Gordian Knot of Martin Smiglecius untied by John Volkelius. Racow, Typ. Seb. Sternacki, 1613, 8vo.

This work is one of extreme rarity. In that to which it was a reply, and which was entitled "The Gordian Knot," Martin Smiglecus, the Jesuit, endeavoured to shew, that there could be no truly ordained, and properly qualified Christian Minister, out of the pale of the Romish Church. To the arguments adduced by him with that view, Volkelius replied, as far as the Socinians were concerned; leaving it to other Churches to make what reply they thought proper. Smiglecus answered Volkelius in 1614; and in 1618, Volkelius published

2. An Answer to the unsatisfactory "Refutation" of "The Gordian Knot of Martin Smiglecus untied," by John Volkelius. Racow, 1618, 4to. In this controversy Valentine Smalcus took the part of his friend Volkelius, in some Notes on Smiglecus's pretended "Refutation," which were published at Racow in 1614. On the part of the Calvinists, answers to Smiglecus were written by James Zaborowski, and Andrew Firley.

3. Five Books of John Volkelius, of Meissen, on true Religion; to which is prefixed a Book of John Crellius, Frank, on God and his Attributes; so as to form one Work. Racow, Typ. Seb. Sternacki, 1630, 4to. The Books of Volkelius were printed, either wholly or in part, before Crellius had finished the composition of his. Ruarus, in a letter to Francis Limborch, written in 1620, alludes to Volkelius's portion of this work as already before the public; but says of it, "capite adhuc caret, quod Crellius noster adornat." It was not till ten years later that the First Book made its appearance. Hence the order of the pages is twofold. The First Book, which was supplied by Crellius, fills about one-third part of the Volume, and extends as far as page 352. The remaining five Books, which were written by Volkelius, occupy 715 pages. The subject of the First Book is indicated in the title-page.

The Second is On the Works of God; the Third, On the Christian Religion; the Fourth, On the Precepts of Christ; the Fifth, On the Aids requisite for Perseverance in Faith and Piety; and the Sixth, On the Church of Christ. The Preface is written by Crellius; and there are copious Indexes of passages of Scripture explained and illustrated, and of the principal matters treated upon in the course of the volume. The work ranks among the principal systems of the Socinian doctrine, and was regarded by the Socinians themselves as occupying the next place to the Racovian Catechism. Grotius, in a letter addressed to John Crellius, (*Epp. Præstant. et Erudit. Virorum*, p. 763,) speaks of it in the following terms. "I find many observations in it, made with the greatest judgment; but on this I congratulate the age, that men are found, who do not attach so much importance to subtle controversies, as to the true improvement of life, and daily advancement towards holiness. In the opinion of Reimannus there is in Volkelius much genius, no slight degree of acumen, and the greatest diligence. What lies scattered up and down in the writings of Socinus and his followers, we have here before us collected into a single volume." Volkelius's portion of this admirable work was composed as early as the year 1612; and he was repeatedly urged to revise it, which he did after much importunity, so as to prepare it for the press in 1617. But its publication was delayed by his death, which took place in the year following. In 1619, Daniel Franconius was commissioned to write out a fair copy, and transmit it without delay to Racow, in order that it might be committed to the press, after having undergone the usual previous revision. The copy was soon made; and in 1622 a resolution was passed, that it should be handed over for revision and correction to Moscorovius, Goslavius, Smalcus, Crellius and Ruarus, with

a view to its publication. At the next Synod, in 1623, 110 florins were voted for this purpose; in addition to which the Messrs. Czaplic promised two or three hundred, and Stanislaus Lubieniecius contributed two hundred and thirty more. In 1624, Crellius was again urged to use all speed in the work of revision; and in 1625, he was requested to suspend all his other labours, in order to complete this, and particularly to re-compose the first Book, which, as it would seem, underwent a thorough change, so as to appear at length as an original composition of Crellius. In 1629, the work was sent to the press; and in addition to the sums already mentioned, Cikovius contributed a hundred florins, and John Krokier another hundred, towards the expenses of publication. All this shews, of how great importance the Socinians thought this work of Volkelius; and what extraordinary care was taken, in preparing it for the public eye. It appears, from the title-page, that the first edition issued from the press in 1630; and so much was it sought after, that Sandius records an instance of a copy having been sold, in France, for the sum of twenty-five Hungarian pistoles. A second edition was clandestinely printed at Amsterdam, in 1642, 4to., by the firm of Blaeu, where, according to some accounts, five hundred copies, according to others, four hundred and fifty, were publicly burnt, by order of the Magistrates, on the 20th of January, 1642. A fine of twelve hundred florins was at the same time imposed upon the printers: but this fine was afterwards remitted. Curcellæus, in writing to his friend Ruarus, Feb. 8th, 1642, says that the reason of this edition being committed to the flames was, that Volkelius referred the doctrine of the Trinity to Satan as its author. In another letter, written to the same friend on the 12th of April in the same year, he says, that the new Magistrates, elected according to custom at the beginning of

February, had rescinded the sentence passed by their predecessors upon the printers, who, however, had been so alarmed by what had taken place, that they were not likely, in future, to engage in printing works of that description. Vogt, who possessed a copy of the second edition, says, that it had in the title-page no indication of time, or place, or printer's name. A Dutch translation of it was published at Rotterdam in 1649, 4to., in the title-page of which it was stated, that the work had been previously condemned and burnt. The title-page also set forth, that this version was published by a Lover of the Kingdom of Christ, for the Instruction and Confirmation of the Subjects of Christ in Holland. Maresius, in his "*Hydra Socinianismi expugnata*," published at Groningen, in three Volumes, 4to., 1651—1662, inserted the whole of Volkelius's work, with a weak and frigid reply of his own. It has been thought, that this was done by the advice of his bookseller, to aid the sale of his own refutation.

4. Erklärung der Meinungen von dem alleinigen Gotte. 1616, 4to.

5. Sandius remarks, that Scherzer attributes to Volkelius a work On Ecclesiastical Discipline. (*Vide Art.* 212, No. 14.)

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 96. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* VOLKELIUS. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 992—1003. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. pp. 360—362. *Schomanni* Testamentum, p. 196, Anno 1585. *Ruari* Epistolæ, Cent. i. N. 86, 87. *Thomæ Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. v. p. 264. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. pp. 451—455. *Vogt*, Catal. Libr. Rarior. p. 714.

145.

ERNEST SOHNER was born at Nuremberg, in Franconia, in the year 1572. His father, Mark Sohner, was a merchant, a respectable citizen, and a man of no ordinary merit, on which account he was invested, by Maximilian

II., with the privileges of nobility. Ernest received his school education at Nuremberg; and was sent to the University of Altorf in the month of August, 1588. He studied Philosophy and Medicine under Philip Scherbius, and Nicholas Taurelli. At the end of April, 1597, he accompanied Christopher Fürer, and Christopher Schlaundersbach, two young men of noble rank, through Holland, France, Italy and Great Britain; and formed an acquaintance with many literary and scientific men, in the course of his travels.

When he left Altorf, no suspicion of heresy had fallen upon him; nor is there the least reason to suppose, that his mind was then at all prepossessed in favour of the doctrines, which he afterwards embraced, and to the diffusion of which he so greatly contributed. Thomas Crenius thought, indeed, that he was erroneously charged with Socinianism in the subsequent part of his life; but what Zeltner has related concerning him, in his "History of Crypto-Socinianism at Altorf," and Ruarus, in the second Century of his Epistles, (No. 26,) clearly proves, not only that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, but that he was, in private at least, active and unwearied in his endeavours to undermine the popular faith.

It has been said, that he formed an intimacy with Conrad Vorstius at Leyden, and that it was Vorstius who first unsettled his religious principles. But this report has been shewn by Zeltner to be incorrect, and its truth chronologically impossible. It was from Voidovius and Ostorod, who happened to be staying at Leyden, with some Polish youths of whom they had the charge, while Sohner was there, that his mind took its first bias towards Socinianism. (Vide *Art.* 125, 126.) Zeltner mentions a keepsake, which Sohner received from Voidovius during his stay at Leyden, and which he himself had seen, bearing the following in-

scription. “Quis sapiens * * * corrueat in eis” (vide Hos. C. xvi. ult.): “Ornatissimo Dno. Ernesto Sonero, Norimbergensi, artium et philosophiæ Magistro, studioso pietatis: amico honorando, Andreas Voidovius scripsi. Lugd. Batav. Septembris 10 Ao. unigenæ Dei 1598.” (Hist. Crypto-Soc. p. 33, Not. b.) It appears, also, that, from this time, Sohner commenced an epistolary correspondence with Ostorod.

When he had finished his travels, and taken the highest medical honours at Basle, he began to practise as a Physician at Nuremberg; but was called, in the course of a few years, to succeed his former Tutor, Scherbius, at Altorf, where he became a popular Teacher of Physics and Medicine, in which he chiefly followed Aristotle and Galen. From this time till the period of his death, he carried on a regular correspondence with the Polish Brethren; and secretly instilled his religious sentiments into the minds of his pupils, among whom two of the most promising were John Crellius and Michael Gittichius. There seemed a probability, indeed, that Socinianism would firmly establish itself within the walls of the University of Altorf; but the death of Sohner, which took place on the last day of September, 1612, at the early age of forty, and of which John Crellius, on his flight from Altorf, carried the first tidings into Poland, prevented such a consummation.

Mosheim, speaking of Sohner, says, “This subtile philosopher, who had joined the Socinians during his residence in Holland, instilled their principles into the minds of his scholars with much greater facility, by his having acquired the highest reputation, both for learning and piety. The death, indeed, of this eminent man, which happened in the year 1612, deprived the rising society of its chief ornament and support; nor could the remaining friends of Socinianism carry on the cause of their community with such art

and dexterity, as to escape the vigilant and severe eye of the other Professors. Their secret designs were accordingly brought to light in the year 1616; and the contagion of Socinianism, which was gathering strength from day to day, and growing imperceptibly into a reigning system, was all of a sudden dissipated and extinguished by the vigilant severity of the Magistrates of Nuremberg. The foreign students, who had been infected with these doctrines, saved themselves by flight; while the natives, who were chargeable with the same reproach, accepted of the remedies that were presented to them by the healing hand of orthodoxy, and returned quietly to their former theological system."

The secret name, by which Sohner was distinguished among the Unitarian students at Altorf, was *Philetus*, or *Philetes*, a name which had its origin, according to Zeltner, in their great affection for their Tutor, and a remembrance of the singular kindness and urbanity by which he was distinguished, and which might be traced in his portrait, and a copper-plate engraving of it.

At the head of the supplementary matter, which Zeltner has appended to his "History of Crypto-Socinianism at Altorf," is a letter addressed by Sohner to his friend, Dr. Leonhard Doldius, and written March 5th, 1605, while he was residing at Nuremberg, which indicates, in no obscure or doubtful terms, the state of his mind at that time in religious matters. Subjoined to this letter is a long extract from a Catechism by Sohner in German, written with the greatest care, and with extraordinary perspicuity; and containing, as Gundling and Zeltner suppose, the first project and outline of a Socinian Catechism. The following is an account of the writings of Sohner.

1. A Disputation against Matthew Radecius concerning the Immortality of the Soul. A manuscript copy of this

Disputation was deposited in the Baumgartenian Library ; and is mentioned, in the Catalogue of MSS. in that Collection, p. 90, No. 238, under the title, “*Ratio quâ probatur Immortalitas Animæ.*”

2. A theological and philosophical Demonstration, that the Eternal Punishments of the Wicked argue, not the Justice, but the Injustice of God. 1654, 12mo. Zeltner doubted whether this work on future punishments was ever published, although Sandius expressly refers to it, as having appeared in the year 1654. Sandius’s testimony on this point has since been fully verified. In that year a little volume of Theological Tracts was published, bearing the following title. “*Fausti et Lælii Socini, item Ernesti Soneri, Tractatus aliquot Theologici, nunquam antehac in Lucem editi. Eleutheropoli, Typis Godofr. Philadelphii, 1654.*” This volume, which has been reckoned among the scarcest of books, contains six treatises ; and the fifth of these is Sohner’s against the doctrine of eternal punishment. It was translated into Dutch ; and the original Latin seems to have been reprinted in England.

3. Arguments to prove that God the Father only is the God of Israël. These Arguments are without doubt the same, which are designated by Ruarus, (Epp. Cent. ii. N. 43,) “*Reasons against the Trinity, from F. Socinus’s Reply to Wujek, collected by that celebrated Man, D. E. S.*”

4. A Disputation concerning Predestination.

5. Explanation of Acts xxvi. 6.

6. On the Unity of Souls, and on Intelligences.

7. Appendix to the Question concerning the Unity of Souls after their Separation from the Body. *MS.*

8. On the Lord’s Supper.

9. On the Doctrine of Satisfaction, against Albert Graver.

10. Disputations and a Commentary on the Metaphysic

of Aristotle. Jena, 1657, 4to. A second edition was published at Jena, in 1666, 4to., for Matthew Birckner. It was edited by John Paul Felwinger, who added a Dissertation of his own concerning Angels, in which he took the opposite view to Sohner, endeavouring to prove that Angels were not, as had been maintained by Sohner, corporeäl substances.

11. A German Catechism. *MS.* Zeltner, besides giving an account of the contents of this Catechism, in the body of his History of Crypto-Socinianism, (p. 46,) has inserted the whole of the last five Chapters (viz. from Chap. xiv. to xviii.) in the Supplement to that work (pp. 820—856). The subject of these Chapters was the sacerdotal and royal office of Christ.

12. A Treatise on the Obedience of a Christian Man. *MS.* Zeltner once thought, (p. 50,) that this was the same work as the preceding one; but afterwards (pp. 513 and 1239) retracted that opinion, and threw out a conjecture, that it was not only a different work from the Catechism, but that Matthew Radecius was its author.

13. Three Theological Problems, discussed under the form of a Dialogue. I. Whether the Regenerate can abstain from sinning, and obey the Law or Precepts of Christ? II. Whether Paul, Rom. vii. 7—, speaks in his own Person? III. Whether, under the Old Testament, Men had only corporal Promises, and none of eternal Life?

14. A Letter to Leonhard Doldius, written March 5th, 1605. In this Letter, which has been mentioned above, the author unfolds his mind on the subject of religion.

15. A Discourse “De Ente.” This Discourse was unknown to Zeltner.

16. A Funeral Oration for Christopher Fürer von Haimendorf; published at the end of Fürer’s “Itinerary of Egypt, Arabia,” &c. Nuremberg, 1620, 4to.

17. Disputations and Orations of Sohner and others, collected by John Paul Felwinger, and published under the title, “*Philosophia Altdorffiana*.” Nuremb. 1644, 4to. In this work, some of the philosophical disputations and orations, not only of Sohner, but of Scherbius and Michael Piccart, are rescued from oblivion.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 96, 97. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 894—903. *Thom. Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. v. C. iii. § viii. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 26—51. 354. 819. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1612, apud Zeltner. p. 1197. *Ruari* Epistolæ, Cent. ii. N. 26. *Enfield's* Hist. of Philosophy, Bk. viii. Chap. iii. Sect. ii. *Moshemii* Inst. H. E. Sæc. xvii. Sect. ii. P. ii. C. vi. § ii. *Vogt*, Catal. Libr. Rarior. pp. 635, 636.

146.

CHRISTOPHER DINDERSTADT is claimed as an Antitrinitarian by Sandius, who says, that he was the author of a work, entitled, “*De Promisso Jesu adversus Judæos*.” Whether this work was printed, or existed only in manuscript, Sandius does not inform us.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 97.

147.

CHRISTOPHER EOUS is also included in Sandius's list of Antitrinitarian authors. It appears that he wrote a German work, entitled, “*Von der Kirchen Christi*,” and from the position assigned to him by Sandius, it may be inferred, that he flourished about the beginning of the seventeenth century.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 97.

148.

JAMES SIENINIUS, (*Polon.* SIENNYNSKI,) a Polish Knight, Palatine of Podolia, and Toparch of Racow, was the son of John Sieninius. Racow was the property of the family of the Sieninii. It was founded by John Sieninius in 1569;

and situated about a mile from Sidlow, in the Palatinate of Sandomir. Its founder gave it the name of Racow, or Rakow, in compliment to his lady, whose family name was *Rak*, denoting a crab, the family arms. Here various persons, both natives of Poland and foreigners, were induced to settle, attracted by the numerous advantages granted to the colonists, and particularly by the unrestrained freedom of opinion that was ensured to them. The town increased rapidly in population and prosperity; and became one of the most remarkable places in Poland. It is now an insignificant village.

John Sieninius was a Calvinist, and his son James was brought up in that persuasion; but being converted to the Unitarian faith by John Securus, in the course of a debate held at Racow on the 13th of November, 1599, between the Unitarians and the Calvinists, he withdrew, in the year following, from the communion of the Reformed Church, and joined that of the Unitarians, of which he proved a munificent patron.

An Antitrinitarian congregation, of which Gregory Pauli was the Minister, was established in the new settlement; and the number of members received large accessions from Cracow, and other quarters. In the year 1602, at the suggestion of Stanislaus Lubieniecius, the elder, with whom James Sieninius had contracted a friendship at Court in early life, he erected a public School, or College, designed as a seminary for the Unitarian Church; and established a printing-office, for the more effectual diffusion of Unitarian sentiments, through the medium of the press. (Vide *Art.* 94.) Both these were at Racow, his own town, which thus became the centre of the Unitarian community, and from which they afterwards derived the name of *Racovians*. The College flourished almost beyond the expectation of its founder. Sandius refers to its code of Laws, which

was printed by Sebastian Sternacki. (B. A. p. 175.) Its first Moderators were James Sieninius; Jerome Moscorovius; Stanislaus Wyzicius; Christopher Morstinus, Starost of Philipovia; John Baptist Cettis; Adam Goslavius; Samuel Golecus; Benedict Wissowatius; Peter Statorius; John Volkelius; Andrew and Stanislaus Lubieniecus; Valentine Smalcus; Simon Pistorius, and Andrew Voidovius. Its most eminent Rectors were, Christopher Brockayus; George Manlius; Samuel Nieciecius; Paul Krokier; John Crellius; Martin Ruarus; Joachim Stegmann; Adam Franck; Peter Teichmann; George Nigrinus, and Laurence Stegmann. It was frequented by Roman Catholics, and the youth of different Protestant communities, as well as Unitarians; and the number of students educated within its walls generally amounted to about a thousand. Indeed, it was so celebrated, as to gain for Racow the appellation of the Sarmatian Athens; and among the number of its Professors, it reckoned some of the most eminent scholars in Poland. But in 1638, when James Sieninius was in his seventieth year, both the College and the printing-office were destroyed in a riot, excited by an act of indiscretion on the part of some of the students. The privileges which the Unitarians had enjoyed were greatly abridged after this time, and scarcely anything remained but the shadow of a great name. Sieninius survived this calamity only about one year. He left a son, who remained steady to his principles, as an Antitrinitarian; but Racow is said to have come, by inheritance, at a later period, into the possession of his granddaughter, the widow of Christopher Wissowatius, who, after her husband's death, abandoned the religion of her father and grandfather, and became a convert to Catholicism. The following are the only writings attributed to James Sieninius.

1. The Dedication of the Latin Version of Smalcus's

treatise, "On the Divinity of Christ," to Sigismund III., King of Poland. Racow, 1608. This Dedication was also prefixed to Theodore Raphael Camphuysius's Dutch translation of Faustus Socinus's treatise "On the Authority of Sacred Scripture."

2. Speeches delivered at the Diets of the Kingdom. *MS.*

3. A Letter to Rembert Episcopus, Brother of Simon Episcopus.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 97, 98, 175, 176. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 833, 834, 844. *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xii. *And. Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. p. 214, Ann. 1600. *Moshem.* Inst. Hist. Eccles. Sæc. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. C. iv. § xii. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. p. 337. *Smaleii* Diarium, A. D. 1599. 1605, eum Notis Zeltneri. pp. 1171, 1179. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 380—384. *Robinson's* Eccles. Res. Chap. xv. pp. 618—620.

149.

CHRISTOPHER BROCKAYUS was a Westphalian, and the first Rector of the College of Racow. He was appointed to this office in the year 1603, and retained it till 1605. Before his appointment, he held a disputation on Aristotle's notion of Justice. He died May 15th, 1605; and was interred at Racow, at the same time with Peter Statorius, Junior, Smalcus performing the funeral service for both.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 78. *Smaleii* Diarium, A. D. 1605. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vita Andr. Wissowatii, p. 229.

150.

SIMON POLANUS and MARTIN WILHELM settled at Luclavice, when the Church and School of that place were in their most flourishing condition. They were, as Lubieniecius says, the best and most celebrated Chemists in the kingdom of Poland. The same author informs us, that Simon Polanus assisted Jerome Moscorovius in his chemical

and medical studies; but the rest of his history lies buried in the deepest obscurity.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 645, 646. 1008. *Lubienicci* Hist. Ref. Pol. L. iii. C. xv. p. 273. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. p. 274.

151.

CONRAD VORSTIUS, (or VORST,) was born at Cologne, on the 19th of July, 1569. His grandfather was Counsellor to the Elector; and Diedrick Vorst, his father, was a Dier. Conrad Vorstius was sent, in 1578, to Bedberdyk, in the county of Reifferscheid, where he learned Latin and Greek for five years. From this place he was removed to Dusseldorf, where he studied the Philosophy of Ramus; and in the year 1586, to Aix-la-Chapelle, where he applied himself to that of Aristotle. Returning to Cologne, he went through a course of Philosophy in the College of St. Lawrence. He refused the degree of Master of Arts, being unwilling to subscribe the Canons of the Council of Trent. John Badius, one of the persecuted Ministers of Cologne, advised him to study Divinity, which he did at Herborn, under Piscator, for about three years; and at Heidelberg for the space of four years, where he took the degree of Doctor of Theology, in July, 1594. He afterwards travelled into Upper Germany, Switzerland and France; and in all those countries, he obtained the esteem of the most eminent Divines, and other learned men. In the year 1595, he presided at a theological disputation in the University of Basle, for the Professor Grynæus; and read lectures in the Academy of Geneva, at the desire of Theodore Beza.

He had been distinguished at College for his diligence and irreproachable conduct; and in 1596, he published a collection of Theses, which were thought to exhibit a tendency towards Socinianism: but this operated so little to

his disadvantage, that, in 1605, he was appointed Professor of Theology in the Gymnasium at Steinfurt. Suspensions, however, at length attached to him; and he found himself under the necessity of making a confession of his faith at Heidelberg. This was accepted, and he met with no further molestation during his residence at Steinfurt.

In 1610, he was nominated to succeed Arminius, in the University of Leyden; and though he was beloved and honoured at Steinfurt, and foresaw, from the state of parties at Leyden, that he would have to encounter much opposition there, he was tempted to accept the appointment, as it has been said, by the reputation which he expected to acquire, as the leader of a party, that had been greatly weakened by the death of Arminius. He had the reputation of a pious man, and a lover of peace and moderation; and some eminent Divines among the Reformed, particularly Abraham Scultetus, approved of his appointment, while others strenuously opposed it. Their opposition, however, arose principally from his ascribing too great an authority, as they thought, to the Magistrate, in Ecclesiastical matters; and from a suspicion, that he would favour the Remonstrant party. He had published his treatise "*De Deo*" in 1610; and some passages in this treatise were thought to favour the doctrine of Arminius; some to lead to Socinianism; and some, to have an ulterior tendency.

Before he left Steinfurt, he had two Conferences with Peter Plancius, Minister of Amsterdam, who had inveighed against him in his sermons, as an innovator, and a favourer of the opinions of Arius, Paul of Samosata, and others. These Conferences took place in the presence of the Burgomasters; and when Vorstius shewed, that Calvin and Mercier had understood several passages of Scripture as he himself did, Plancius was reduced to silence upon that

article, and some others. This pugnacious Divine, however, delivered a long discourse, to shew how necessary it was to believe the doctrine of the Trinity; and asked Vorstius, whether he was orthodox upon that point. Vorstius demanded satisfaction for the insult which he had received; M. Hooft, one of the Burgomasters, took his part; and he returned to Steinfurt, with letters from the Committee of the States for the Count of that name, who was requested to grant him leave to settle in Holland.

James the First, King of England, in 1611, caused Vorstius's treatise "*De Deo*" to be burnt at St. Paul's Cross, and in both Universities; and made heavy complaints to the States, on account of their tolerating the author. He also wrote a "*Confutation of Vorstius*," of which Fuller, the Church Historian, speaks in the following adulatory terms. "Once I intended to present the Reader with a Brief of His Majesties Declaration, till deterred with this Consideration, that although great Masses of Lead, Tinne, and meaner Metals, may by the extraction of Chymists be epitomized and abridged into a Smaller quantity of Silver, yet what is altogether Gold already, cannot without extraordinary damage, be reduced into a Smaller Proportion. And seeing each word in His Majesties Declaration is so pure and pretious, that it cannot be lessened without losse, we remit the Reader to the same in his Majesties Works."

Being favoured with an audience of the States, most of the members of that assembly were satisfied with the answers which Vorstius made to the accusations of his adversaries. Many thought that his vindication of himself was quite satisfactory; and that he ought to be allowed to take possession of his Professorship. Others, who still had doubts upon the subject, recommended that he should be dismissed with an advantageous testimonial. At last the States thought fit to send his Apology, which was

couched in the most respectful terms, to the King of Great Britain. They ordered him to answer, in a printed book, all that had been published against him. They allowed him a whole year, for the purpose of preparing that Answer, in the town of Gouda; and urged him to examine his works, and acknowledge any errors which he might perceive in them. His first defence of himself was entitled, "Conr. Vorstii S. Theol. D. Brevis Refutatio Speciminis, a Leowardiensibus Ecclesiastis adversum ipsum editi. Lugd. Bat. 1612," 4to. This was followed by his "Prodromus Plenioris Responsi, suo Tempore cum Deo secuturi, ad Declarationem D. Sibrandi Lubberti, et iteratam Ministrorum Leowardiensium Cautionem, aliaque plura id genus aliorum Eristica scripta, recenter in Lucem adversus ipsum emissas;" and then by the "Responsum Plenius" itself. Lugd. Bat. 1612, 4to.

Uitenbogaerdt, who had promoted his appointment to the Professorial chair at Leyden, wrote to him a short time afterwards in these terms. "The University, the Church, the Curators, and the States expect a Christian Professor, not an Ostorodian." (Epp. Remonstrant, p. 275.)

Fuller says, "This Vorstius had both written and received severall Letters from certain Samosatenian Hereticks, in Poland, or thereabouts; and it hapned that he had handled Pitch so long, that at last it stuck to his Fingers, and he became infected therewith." Sandius hesitated, however, for a while, whether he should include him in his list of Antitrinitarian writers. At last his scruples were removed, when he read a Confession of Faith, signed with Vorstius's own hand, near the close of his life, in which he explicitly declared his sentiments, respecting God the Father, and Jesus Christ. But of this more hereafter.

At the hundred and forty-ninth Session of the Synod of Dort, May 2nd, 1619, the Commissioners recommended to

the assembly, to examine the writings of Vorstius. Being informed that they were about to judge him in his absence, he addressed to them a long letter in Latin, in which he endeavoured to justify himself. After the reading of this letter, several passages were produced, which the Dutch Professors had extracted from his writings; but his friends had neither courage, nor interest enough to prevent his condemnation, and it does not appear that any member of the assembly spoke on his behalf. On the day following the English deputies read similar extracts from his works; and demanded that his book “*De Deo*” should be burnt in a solemn manner. The other Divines declared that he ought to be deprived of his Professorship; and in reference to an offer which he had made to write against the Socinians, the assembly said,—

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget. Virg. *Æn.* ii. 521.

At the next sitting, May 4th, the first draught of the sentence to be passed upon him and his doctrine was read; and at another sitting, on the same day, it was approved by the assembly, and adopted with some amendments. It set forth, That Conrad Vorstius, in addition to his maintaining the errors of the Five Articles of the Remonstrants, had called in question most of the fundamental doctrines of the Reformed Religion; the Trinity of persons in the divine essence; the simplicity, immensity, omniscience, omnipotence, and immutability of the divine nature; the creation; the providence of God; the personal union of both natures in Christ; his perfect expiation for our sins; men’s justification by faith; and many other articles,—as the Most Potent King of Great Britain, and several Divines had shewn: That he maintained many doctrines, which agree with the blasphemies of the wicked Socinus, or come

very near them : That he endeavoured to weaken the main arguments for the eternal divinity of Christ, which venerable antiquity, and the Reformed Divines take from the Holy Scriptures : and, That he craftily laboured to introduce the impious heresies of Socinus and other sects. Lastly, the Synod declares, that Vorstius is unworthy of the office and title of an Orthodox Professor, and a Doctor of the Reformed Church ; and beseeches Their High Mightinesses to interpose their authority, for removing that scandal, &c.

The sentence was dated May 4th ; but Vorstius, who lived at Gouda, had no notice of it till some days after. The States of Holland deprived him of his Professorship at Leyden, and banished him from their province ; and he was afterwards banished from all the United Provinces. Many were of opinion, that he had been treated with too much severity. One of the Counts of Bentheim, who had a great esteem for him, ordered that he should be received into his palace. It is not known why he refused the Count's offer ; but the historian intimates, that Vorstius was afraid of being arrested on the road, and transported into England, where Bartholomew Legate, and Edward Wightman, had been burnt on a charge of heresy, a few years before.

At first, Vorstius concealed himself in a house not far distant from Utrecht, and in other places ; but, fearful of being discovered, he retired, in the year 1622, into Holstein, with an honourable certificate from the Magistrates of Gouda, who testified, that his conduct had always been virtuous, modest and edifying. He had previously requested the Duke of Holstein's permission to settle in his dominions, and sent to that Prince an Apology, in which he declared, that he followed the opinions of the Remonstrants, contained in their "Confession of Faith ;" and

that the other doctrines, ascribed to him by his enemies, were mere calumnies, or philosophical matters, which did not concern Christianity. The Duke having received this Apology, submitted it to the examination of certain Divines; and, they having approved of it, the Duke intimated to Vorstius, not only that his arrival would be acceptable to him, but also that he would take him into his protection and service.

Vorstius received another invitation from the Count of Steinfurt, who sent him an officer of his household, and a Minister, with a calash. That Count was resolved to employ him in the Church, notwithstanding the sentence passed upon him by the National Synod of Dort. But Vorstius politely declined the Count's liberal offer; and set out privately for Holstein. He went first to Amsterdam, where the celebrated Dutch poet, Joost van Vondel, afforded him shelter and protection in his house for some days; and then conducted him to Horn, from which place he repaired to Tonningen by sea, in the month of June. Vorstius undertook that voyage with the approbation of the directors of the affairs of the Remonstrants; and as soon as he arrived, the Duke of Holstein received him with great demonstrations of kindness, and made him his Chaplain.

Vorstius hoped to enjoy some quietness, after all his misfortunes; but his hopes were short-lived and vain. He had been literally hunted to death, like his predecessor Arminius. (*Vide* Appendix, No. viii.) Exhausted by his troubles, he was attacked by a disease in the month of September, and died in the course of ten days. The remedies administered by his friend and Physician, Dr. Peter van Dam, who had accompanied him from Utrecht to Tonningen, proved unavailing; and he taught his Physician, and his other friends, how it became a Christian to die.

He gave over all thoughts of a longer continuance in this world; and devoted the remainder of his short term of life chiefly to prayer, and the repetition of favourite passages of Scripture. He declared several times, that he had no scruple about any of his books. He said more than once, that he was perfectly satisfied with the Confession of the Remonstrants. In his last conversations, he frequently mentioned the resurrection of the dead; and wished that those, who had charged him with disbelieving that doctrine, might hear his last Confession. He desired that the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and the fifteenth of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, in which mention is made of the resurrection, might be read to him. When his strength failed, and he began to lose his power of utterance, with the signs of approaching death in his countenance, he desired Herbold Tomberg to write down what he should dictate to him about certain articles of the Christian Faith. He spoke as long as he was able; and concluded with these words. "After this," (alluding to his previous declaration of belief in God, as the Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, as our Saviour, who is to be adored with the most perfect veneration, and under whom his heavenly Father has put all things, without excluding anything but Him who has put all things under him,) "if any one should undertake to abuse my little authority, I positively declare, as I have done formerly, that I make a difference between the Lord Jesus, the Son of God, our only and eternal Saviour, and Him, who is the only true God Almighty, according to the words of the Holy Spirit, which occur so frequently in the New Testament."

Tomberg having written these words, the sick man had hardly strength enough to set his hand to them; and his name could not be read without much difficulty. Soon after, (it was on the 29th of September, O. S., between

three and four o'clock in the morning,) he recommended his soul to God, and Jesus Christ his Saviour, and then expired. His body was carried from Tonningen to Frederickstadt, being attended by seven coaches; and was buried in a vault, under the place, where the Church of that new town was afterwards built. Grævius preached his funeral sermon.

Vorstius was a married man; and his wife followed him to Tonningen, and arrived there the very day that his last illness commenced. She survived him, with a family of five young children; one of whom afterwards greatly excelled as a Hebrew scholar, and had the pastoral charge of a Remonstrant Church at Warmond. (*Vide Art.* 250.)

The following list will be found to contain the titles of most of the works of Conrad Vorstius.

1. Theses on various Points of Dogmatic Theology, published at different Times; viz. On the Sacrament; On the Causes of Salvation; On Jesus Christ the Saviour; On Predestination; On the Trinity; On the Person and Office of Christ; and an Idea of Theology in general. Siegen, 1596, 8vo.

2. Disputations concerning God, or concerning the Nature and Attributes of God. Steinf. 1602, 4to. This work was afterwards enlarged, and published with copious notes at Steinfurt, in 1610, 4to.; and at Hanover, in 1610, 4to.

3. Manual of the Controversies between the Calvinists and the Roman Catholics; or, an Index of the Errors of the Romish Church, with an Antidote. Steinf. 1604, 8vo.; Hanov. 1608, 8vo.; Lond. 1608, 12mo.

4. An Apology for the Orthodox Churches, opposed to the Jesuits of Munster. 1607, 8vo. A reply to this was published under the title "*Apodixis*," which Vorstius answered in a work, entitled, "*Antapodixis*, concerning the

first three Articles of Faith." Hanov. 1609, 8vo.; 1665, 8vo.

5. *Tessaradecas Anti-Pistoriana*: or an Answer to a Book of John Pistorius, on fourteen controverted Articles of Religion. Hanov. 1607, 8vo.

6. An Epistolary Protest against the Censure passed upon his Treatise concerning God by the Divines of Heidelberg. Hagenau, 1610.

7. *Anti-Bellarmin* abridged: or a compendious Examination of all the Controversies carried on between the Calvinists and the Roman Catholics. Hanov. 1610, 4to.

8. *Apologetica Exegesis*: or a fuller Declaration of some Passages extracted from his "Treatise concerning God," &c., and imputed to him as erroneous. Leyden, 1611, 4to. This was published first in Latin, and afterwards in Dutch.

9. A Reply to some Articles lately sent from England. Leyden, 1611. 1613, 4to. This was Vorstius's Answer to King James I.

10. Preface to Faustus Socinus's Book concerning the Authority of Scripture. Steinf. 1611, 8vo.

11. Notes upon F. Socinus's Disputation concerning Jesus Christ the Saviour.

12. A Compendium of the Doctrine of the Christian Church, now flourishing chiefly in Poland. 1630. This made its appearance both in Latin and Dutch. Cloppenburg, who published a reply to it, attributes it to Ostorod and Voidovius; but others say, that it was compiled, by Vorstius, from the writings of the Socinians.

13. Several Tracts in controversy with John Piscator, on Predestination. 1612—1618.

14. Several Tracts in controversy with Sibrand Lubbert, and others, vindicating himself from a Charge of Heresy. Leyden, 1612.

15. A Reply to Matthew Slade's Disputation on the

Blasphemies, Heresies, and Atheisms, distinguished with a black Mark, by James, King of England, in Vorstius's "Treatise concerning God." Gouda, 1615, 4to.

16. An Apologetical Reply to Hommius's Specimen of Dutch Controversies. Gouda, 1618, 4to.

17. On the New Testament. Herborn, 1621, 4to.

18. A Commentary on all the Apostolical Epistles, except 2 Tim., Tit., Philem. and Heb. Amst. 1631, 4to.

19. A Confession of Faith concerning God and Jesus Christ, signed with Vorstius's own hand.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 98, 99. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 1003, 1004; T. II. p. 140. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. II. pp. 86. 96. 98; Vol. III. pp. 172. 291; Vol. IV. pp. 23. 413. 418—424. *De la Roche's* Abridgment of Brandt, Vol. I. pp. 309, 310. 318—321; Vol. II. pp. 513—516. 720—729. *Butler's* Life of Grotius, Chap. vii. pp. 124—129. *Walchii* Biblioth. Theol. T. I. pp. 217. 292, 293. 296. 358. 667; T. II. pp. 141. 194. 451, 452. 537. 546. 558; T. III. p. 152; T. IV. p. 667. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. *Art.* VORSTIUS, etc.

152.

MATTHEW TOROTZKAI was the fifth Superintendent of the Unitarians of Transylvania, in which office he succeeded John Kosa. No particulars of his life are given by Sandius or Bock; but it appears, from a memorandum by Mr. Stephen Kovacs, accompanying the present of a handsomely bound copy of Enyedi's "Explicationes Locorum V. et N. Testamenti" to the library of Manchester New College, that Matthew Torotszkai translated that work into the Hungarian language. This Hungarian version was printed at Clausenburg, in 1619; and again in 1620.

VIDEND. *Art.* 134, 135. Private MS.

153.

VALENTINE SMALCIUS, (*Germ.* SCHMALTZ,) was born at Gotha, one of the principal cities of Thuringia, March 12th,

1572. His father, *Nicholas Schmaltz*, (whence Valentine's assumed name of *Theophilus Nicolaïdes*,) was a person much respected by the citizens and Senators of Gotha, for his legal knowledge, and the honourable character which he bore, as a man of an enlarged and liberal mind. Valentine was the offspring of a second marriage, contracted by his father at the advanced age of eighty-two, or upwards; and he was only three years old at the time of his father's death. He went to school till he was seventeen; and excelled all his schoolfellows in the quickness of his apprehension, and the tenacity of his memory. His master, John Dinckel, who was afterwards appointed Court Preacher at Coburg, and chief Superintendent of the whole Duchy, was accustomed to tell him, while he was yet a boy, that he would be a second Luther. Dinckel was succeeded in his office as preceptor by John Helter, who is reported to have said of his pupil, that he would one day be the plague either of Church or State. Valentine conceived a great dislike for this man, and formed a very low estimate of his qualifications as an instructor. He contrasted very unfavourably with his predecessor; and his mental inferiority was accompanied, as often happens, by an air of conceit, and a tone of dictation, which rendered him anything but a general favourite among his pupils.

Even in his school-boy days, Valentine was accustomed to engage with eagerness in theological disputes; and sometimes expressed himself so unguardedly, as to incur the suspicion of heresy. Not much relishing the mental restraints imposed upon him, he set out, in the summer of the year 1589, with one Valentine Brotkorp as his companion, for the city of Leipzig; and after staying there for a short time, proceeded, in the autumn, to Wittenberg, where he remained about a year and a quarter. In 1590, he returned home; and, in the same year, paid a visit to

his former master, Dinckel, at Coburg, supposing that he might be able, through his interest at Court, to procure some useful occupation. But being disappointed in the object of his visit to Coburg, he went to Jena; and in the year following visited Strasburg, where he met with Andrew Voidovius, whom he had known by sight at Wittenberg, and who now talked much with him, and began to open his mind to him on religious subjects, at the same time shewing him a copy of Ochinus's "Dialogues." Smalcus promised to accompany Voidovius, and his pupil, Zachariah Krokier, into Poland; but was prevented from undertaking the journey by illness. In 1592, he went a second time to Leipzic; and, after remaining there a few weeks, set out on the 18th of September for Smigel, where Voidovius had appointed to meet him. But Voidovius, and his companion Ostorod, who were much employed about this time in missionary labours, not happening to be present when he arrived, he was kindly received and entertained for some days by Christopher Lubieniecius. On the return of Voidovius, the mastership of the School of Smigel was given to Smalcus,—an office which he retained, and the duties of which were satisfactorily discharged by him, till the year 1598.

As soon as he was installed in this office, he devoted the whole powers of his mind to the investigation of truth; and having given to the Unitarian controversy his most attentive consideration, he was admitted, by Baptism, as a member of the Socinian Church, on Christmas-day, 1592. His first care, after his settlement in Poland, was to provide a home for his mother. For this purpose, he undertook a journey to Gotha, on the 27th of December; and returned with her in safety to the Brethren at Smigel, on the last day of January, 1593. Here she received a cordial welcome from the Lady Elizabeth de Zborow Dudithia,

whose three sons, Alexander, Daniel and Jerome, with several other noble youths, were immediately placed under Smalcus's tuition.

In the month of April, 1593, he went again to Leipzic, intending to continue his journey as far as Gotha, for the purpose of taking his sister, Osanna, back with him; but he returned, on being told, by some merchants, who had come to the fair at Leipzic on business, that orders were issued for his apprehension and imprisonment, on the evening of the very day on which he had left Gotha with his mother.

In the course of the same year, his correspondence with Faustus Socinus commenced. That eminent man saw at once his capacity for usefulness as a Christian Minister; and enjoined him, by all means, to apply diligently to his theological studies, and not to let his youth pass away, as he himself had done, in idleness and sloth, at the same time telling him, that it was in his power to make no ordinary proficiency in a knowledge of divine things.

On the 7th of March, 1594, he married Agnes Blechow, whose family name had been *Wotowski*, but was changed to *Blechow*, from an estate of her father's, bearing that name. About this time he exercised the office of Catechist, jointly with Voidovius, in the Church of Smigel; and in the year 1598, he was ordained one of the Ministers of the Church at Lublin, at which place he arrived, accompanied by his wife and children, on the 14th of July in that year. Christopher Lubieniecus had just been appointed to succeed Martin Czechovicus in that city; and had consented to undertake so onerous a charge, only on condition that he should have Smalcus as a colleague. Faustus Socinus, aware of the difficulties with which they would have to contend, wrote an encouraging letter to Lubieniecus on the 14th of August; and on the 31st of

the same month, he addressed another to Smalcus, in which he says, "I am extremely glad, that the Brethren have deemed you worthy of being associated with Christopher Lubieniecius, in the government of the Church at Lublin. Your labour, particularly with such a colleague, will not be beyond your strength. If you can agree to act together, you will easily overcome every difficulty; and especially those which make you most anxious. But you will have the greatest need of Christian patience and prudence, that you may not decline to become all things to all men, as the Apostle Paul says, in order that you may save some." (Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 461.) Here it may be remarked, that Sandius, in his account of Smalcus, says, that he was first Rector of the School at Smigiel, then Pastor at Racow, afterwards at Lublin, and then a second time at Racow. (Bibl. Ant. p. 99.) But Bock supposes Sandius to have been mistaken, in saying that he went as Pastor to Racow, before his settlement at Lublin. (Hist. Ant. T. I. P. ii. p. 840.) It seems probable, however, that a short time intervened between his resignation of the office of Rector of the School at Smigiel, and his acceptance of that of Co-pastor with Christopher Lubieniecius at Lublin; for though we find no record of the fact in his published Diary, the omission is probably owing to some mistake on the part of the transcriber, or printer. The autograph of this Diary came into the hands of Thomas Crenius, who lent it to Zeltner to copy; and Zeltner added it, by way of Supplement, to his "*Historia Crypto-Socinismi*." (T. I. pp. 1158—1218.) But there is evidently some confusion in this part of the printed copy; for the preposition "Ad" is placed, as the catch-word, at the bottom of p. 1168, and the next page begins "24 Julii." It should also be borne in mind, that Socinus's letter, from which an extract is given above, was addressed to Smalcus

“*at Racow*,” on the presumption that he was at that place, when it was written (namely, Aug. 31st, 1598); although Smalcus himself states, that he set out for Lublin on the 3rd of the preceding month, and arrived there, with his wife and children, on the 14th of the same month.

Soon after his settlement at Lublin, he was visited by Faustus Socinus; and, in the course of conversation, allusion was made to the disinclination of the Lithuanian Pastors, to join in the Invocation of Christ. It appears, too, that he had been present at a Synod held at Novogrodek, when that subject was discussed, and the whole weight of the defence of that practice devolved upon him. “It was nothing new to me,” says Socinus, in a letter addressed to him on the 24th of July, 1599, “to learn from your account, that those Lithuanian Pastors were found by no means free from ignorance on this subject. Yet I wonder at Licinius, a man in other respects learned, and well versed in theological writings and disputations, who, from the debate which you had with him, was beginning rightly to apprehend a subject, which had previously not been well considered by him.” (Bibl. Fratr. Pol. T. I. p. 461.)

In the month of June, 1600, Smalcus was sent again into Lithuania, with his colleague, Christopher Lubieniecus, and Christopher Rudnicius, Minister of Surasia, to a Synod convened at Novogrodek; and he undertook a third mission of the same kind, at the close of the same year, for the purpose of bringing the dispute concerning the Invocation of Christ to a close. But Joseph Domanovius, the leader of the Budnæans, declined attending the Conference each time; and it was at length determined, after a protracted debate, that he should be excommunicated. All the rest, we are told, gave in their assent to the Socinian doctrine concerning prayer to Christ, when they had heard the arguments of Smalcus in its favour.

In the year 1603, by a resolution of Synod, Smalcus visited the Churches about Dantzic, with a view to counteract the influence, which some zealots from England had been endeavouring to obtain over the minds of the Antitrinitarians in that vicinity; and, in the year following, he undertook another mission into Lithuania, to settle a dispute which had arisen, on the subject of Baptism.

When he had exercised the office of the ministry at Lublin about seven years, he removed with his family to Racow, Oct. 19th, 1605. This change had been determined upon at the Synod of Racow, in May, 1604; but at the entreaties of the Church at Lublin, he was allowed to remain there some time longer. After this, James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia, was accustomed to call Smalcus his own Pastor. But the attention of this indefatigable labourer in the Lord's vineyard was by no means confined to the duties of the pastoral office. He was employed in visiting the Churches at a distance; in managing controversies with opponents; and in devising means for bringing about a union, partly with the Mennonites, and partly with the Reformed, particularly at a Synod of the Reformed, held at Lublin, in 1612.

Socinus had lived to see the several parties among the Unitarians joined together into one compact body; and able to cope with any opponents, whether Catholic or Protestant, who might assail them in the fair and open field of religious controversy. The Jesuits saw and felt this; and gave up all expectation of reëstablishing the lost ascendancy of the Catholic Church, by fair and honourable means. They determined, therefore, to incite the lower orders of their own community to acts of violence against all reputed heretics; and the Lutherans were the first to suffer from the effects of this persecuting policy. In 1605, the Jesuit Piasecki, addressing his audience from the pulpit,

said, "People of God! destroy and burn their Churches!" This advice the rabble were not slow to adopt. The Lutheran Church of Posnania, where the Jesuits had their College, was first attacked; then that of the Bohemian Brethren. Assassins were hired to take away the lives of Protestant Clergymen; and in the year 1611, John Tyscovicus, (vide *Art.* 180,) a Unitarian of the town of Bielsk, was tried and executed, in violation of every principle of law and equity, for refusing to swear, on a public occasion, in the name of the Trinity. These enormities awakened the Unitarians to a sense of the danger, which threatened the Protestant interest under every form; and induced them to make overtures to the Mennonites and Evangelicals, for a union, which might serve to strengthen the hands of each party against the common enemy.

It was thought, that the circumstance of the Mennonites holding the same opinion as many of the Antitrinitarians on the subject of the Baptism of adults, might be rendered instrumental in bringing about a union with that body; and a proposition to that effect was made at the Synod of Racow, in 1611. Smalcus and Moscorovius drew up the address to the Mennonites, and stated the terms of the proposed union; and the negociation was entrusted to Goslavius and Christopher Lubieniecius. The Mennonites returned a written answer; but the Synod of Racow, in 1613, came to a resolution, that the project must be abandoned as impracticable.

The proposal made by the Unitarians to the Reformed was, that neither party should abandon, or compromise its peculiar religious opinions; but that they should agree to tolerate each other, and meet on terms of mutual peace and concord. But the Calvinistic, or Evangelical party, as they were generally called, declined the proposal, saying, that it was impossible to form any such friendly union,

as long as the Unitarians retained their opinions respecting the Trinity, the Satisfaction of Christ, the mode of Justification, and Baptism. James Zaborowski, one of that party, afterwards published a work in the Polish language, entitled, "*Ogień z Wodom*," that is, Fire and Water. To this Smalcus wrote a reply, in which he undertook to shew, that, on all points strictly fundamental, there was no difference of opinion between the Socinians and the Evangelicals. But as the former could not consent to disown their dearest, and most cherished convictions, and as the latter insisted upon their doing so, as the only condition upon which they could agree to act with them, each of these religious bodies continued to pursue its own course; and by their divisions the Catholics gained strength, and ultimately triumphed over both. The Unitarians, foreseeing what would be the result of the disunion existing among the different sections of Protestants, did not abandon their favourite scheme of a union as hopeless. "This failure," says Count Krasinski, "did not prevent the renewal of similar exertions at the meeting at Gorlice, near the frontiers of Hungary, which gave rise to the delusive hope that an act, impossible in its very nature, might be accomplished." Why this liberal and candid writer should regard the union, contemplated by the Socinians, as "an act impossible in its very nature," it is difficult to say; for there was certainly no bar to such union, but the one interposed by the bigotry and narrow-mindedness of the Evangelical party. In the Remonstrant Church, all who profess themselves Christians, whatever their theological opinions, meet together on harmonious terms; and any one who will compare the writings of their leading men,—Episcopius, Curcellæus, Limborch, Le Clerc and Cattenburgh,—will soon be convinced, that they differ widely among themselves concerning some of the most

important doctrines of Christianity. Charity, a good life, and an abhorrence of persecution, are their principal bonds of union; and why cannot other sincere and conscientious Christians consent to act together, if they will not worship together, upon the same principle? But to return to the meeting at Gorlice. "The Socinians were chiefly represented on that occasion by Smalcus." Krasinski adds, "and Lombardus;" but Lombardus was the principal opponent of Smalcus, as we shall see by and by. (No. 48.) "After having decided on some preliminary arrangements, the meeting was transferred to Ozarow, and finally to Belzyce, where the Protestants had assembled a Synod. The Socinians sent thither their principal leaders, Moskorzewski, Suchodolski, Stoinski and Lubieniecki, who were met on the part of the Protestants chiefly by Krainski, Superintendent of the Churches of Little Poland, and a known ecclesiastical writer. The result was not, and could not be more favourable than that of previous meetings, and the discussions were soon interrupted by the warmth with which the Socinians, and Moskorzewski in particular, sought to impose their opinions on the opposite party. Since that time it does not appear that the subject was ever resumed, though in 1619 an attempt was made to conclude a political alliance against Romanist oppression. This was not attended with better success, notwithstanding that the insurmountable obstacles that rendered the conclusion of a dogmatical union impossible did not stand in the way of such a compact." (Historical Sketch, &c. Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 378, 379.) Perhaps this is as fair a representation of the attempt to form an alliance between the Socinians, and their orthodox Protestant brethren in Poland, as we have any reason to expect from the pen of a Calvinistic Trinitarian; although it must be obvious to any unprejudiced reader, that the only obstacle in the way

of the proposed union, was the extraordinary demand made by the Calvinistic party, that the Unitarians, as a preliminary step, should cease to be Unitarians.

The issue is well known; and affords one of the most instructive warnings, recorded in the pages of history, of the evil consequences resulting from bigotry and exclusiveness. The Jesuits, seeing the elements of disunion already at work in the Protestant camp, and true to the instinct of their own order, had little else to do, than to look silently on, and wait till the two parties should so far weaken each other, as to render both a sure and easy prey. Nor had they to wait long. In the year 1658, the Unitarians were expelled from Poland, by an act of the Diet. The so-called Evangelical Protestants, instead of making an effort to prevent this, did all in their power to promote it; and exulted in the thought, that they were about to witness the downfall of a formidable rival. But from that moment Protestantism itself became virtually extinct in Poland; for in the year 1681, we find Charles II. granting a brief on behalf of the orthodox Polish Protestants, who were then exposed to the most cruel persecution, and were never afterwards able to defend their rights against Catholic encroachments. "These were they," as the author of "*The Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin*" most justly remarks, (pp. 25, 26,) "who had suffered the Unitarians to be banished about twenty years before, when it was in their power to have prevented it, if so much as one of their Deputies had protested against it in the Diet. They willingly permitted, nay they promoted the violation of the liberty of Dissenters not twenty years before; and now, weakened by the loss of the whole Unitarian interest, it came to their own turns to be the sufferers: they had never lost either country, or liberty, if they had not voted themselves out of both, by their (former) votes against the Unitarians. A toleration

or liberty of religion, once tapped, will soon run all out; for break it but in one instance, or party, and you have disannulled the whole reason of it, and all the pleas for it."

The death of Smalcus, who had laboured more zealously, perhaps, than any of his contemporaries, to strengthen the Protestant interest in Poland, took place at Racow on the 8th of December, 1622. He had several children by his wife; but they all died young. His eldest daughter, Christina, was married to John Grotkovius; but she did not survive her father.

As a writer, Valentine Smalcus is one of the most distinguished among the Polish Unitarians. His works are characterized by eloquence and perspicuity; but occasionally exhibit marks of hastiness of temper, from which, as Bock very truly observes, Socinus himself and his followers generally are free. He was greatly distinguished as a controversialist; and was equal to Socinus in learning, acuteness, and argumentative power. Zeltner calls him "*omnium clarissimus athleta*." He was a most accomplished master of the arts of persuasion, as appears from the number of his converts; but it has been insinuated, that he also employed these arts, for the purpose of ingratiating himself with the wealthy. Daniel Clementinus mentions, among other things, that he left property to the amount of twenty thousand florins, or £5000 sterling, the Polish florin being estimated at five shillings of our money. But Schlichtingius denies, that he ever had recourse to unfair, or unjustifiable means, either for the diffusion of his opinions, or the accumulation of wealth. His works are very numerous, and were printed at Racow. They are extremely scarce, few of them having come to second editions, and no collection of them having been inserted in the "*Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*." The following is a brief account of them.

1. On the Divinity of Jesus Christ, by Valentine Smalcus, of Gotha, Minister of the Church of Racow. Typ. Seb. Sternacki, 1608, 4to. The author wrote this, while he presided over the School at Smigel; and it was first published in German, at Racow, in 1593, 8vo. It is drawn up with extraordinary care; and holds a place in the first rank of Socinian writings. It was published in Polish, A. D. 1608, 4to.; and again in German, A. D. 1627, 8vo. The text of this German edition agrees more nearly with that of the Latin, than with the German original. Prefixed to the Latin version was a Dedication by John Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia, to Sigismund III. A Dutch translation of it, by Doerck Raphaels Camphuysen, appeared in 1623, 4to. An elaborate reply to it was published by Cloppenburg at Franeker in 1652, 4to.; and John Paul Felwinger published an examination of it, and of several other Unitarian writings at Altorf, in 1663, 8vo.

2. A Letter to M. Guipert, Co-rector of the School at Gotha, written at Smigel in 1592.

3. A Letter to a certain Saxon Divine, written March 15th, 1593.

4. A short and simple Answer to a Book of Christopher Pelargus in Defence of the Triune God against the New Arians. This is a vindication of a treatise of Faustus Socinus, entitled, "On God, Christ and the Holy Spirit," which had been attacked by Pelargus in 1593.

5. A Discourse delivered at Racow, May 19th, 1605, at the Funeral of Peter Statorius, Jun., and Christopher Brockayus, from John x. 21—28. *Polon. MS.*

6. The Reproach of Peter Skarga by a Polish Noble: or Animadversions upon his Book, entitled, "The Reproach of the Arians." Racow, 1606, 4to. *Polon.*

7. Against the Hutterians, or Moravian Communists, written at the request of Geo. Hoffmann, Citizen of Smigel.

Racow, 1606. *MS. Germ.* Zwicker defended the Moravians against Smalcus. (Vide *Art.* 311, No. 46.)

8. A Dissection or Analysis of the Words of the Lord Jesus, Matt. xxviii. 18. Racow, 1607, 4to. *Polon.* This Analysis contains the refutation of a Discourse, delivered by Peter Skarga, on Trinity Sunday, at Cracow, in 1604.

9. A Book of Psalms and Hymns, used by the Polish Brethren in their Churches. Racow, 1610, 12mo. ; 1625, 12mo. *Polon.* This compilation was made principally by Smalcus; but the reader may refer also to the accounts of Stanislaus Lubieniecius, Jun., (*Art.* 324, No. 8,) John Preussius, (*Art.* 322, No. 2,) Samuel Przypcovich, (*Art.* 208, No. 34,) and John Statorius, or Stoinius (*Art.* 204, No. 9).

10. The Dedication of Faustus Socinus's "Theological Lectures," inscribed to the University of Heidelberg. Racow, 1609.

11. A Short Explanation of the Proëm of John's Gospel. Racow, 1607, 4to. ; 1613, 4to. *Polon.* A German translation of this little work appeared in 1611, 8vo. The author says, that Christ is called "the word," because he was the interpreter of the divine will, and became known by the word of God to the world; that he is called "the Son of God," on account of his eminence and prerogatives, in comparison with other "Sons of God;" and "the only-begotten," because God has loved and exalted no other in the same degree. By "the beginning," in which "the word was," he understands the beginning of the Gospel.

12. Annotations upon the whole of the New Testament, except the Book of Revelation, begun to be written May 11th, 1612. *MS.* These Annotations filled three Quarto volumes. The manuscript came into the possession of John Hartigveld, of Rotterdam, (vide *Art.* 317,) from whose hands it passed into those of Samuel Crellius. (Vide

Art. 358.) Crellius parted with it to Jablonski, Professor of Theology in the University of Frankfort on the Oder. Smalcus was often urged to print these brief Annotations; and at a Synod held in 1620, he was enjoined to proceed with a full Commentary on Matthew's Gospel, and the other books of the New Testament, as soon as he should have committed his smaller Annotations to the press. At the Assembly of Kreutzberg, in 1663, a resolution was passed, authorizing the transmission of his Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, and the Epistle to the Galatians, to the Brethren in Holland, who had expressed a wish to see them. This was probably with a view to their being printed, as a continuation of the "*Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*;" but for some reason, which does not appear, they were not inserted in that collection.

13. A brief Defence of an anonymous "*Treatise on the Church, and the Mission of Ministers*," against the Reply of Andrew Miedzybosz, written five Years ago by Theophilus Nicolaïdes, and now published. Racow, 1612, 8vo. The anonymous author of the "*Treatise on the Church*" was Faustus Socinus. Smalcus's vindication, according to Reimannus, was no trifling performance, and well adapted to create confusion in the ranks of the Papists. The Defence of the "*Treatise on the Church*" is comprised in four, and that of "*The Mission of Ministers*" in two additional chapters, corresponding with the fifth and sixth of Miedzybosz. The style of this, and other controversial works of Smalcus, is bitter and sarcastic; and in these respects his writings contrast unfavourably with those of Socinus, and other leading Unitarian authors, which may be the reason why they were not reprinted in the "*Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*." In other respects they were well adapted to advance the cause of the Socinians, and fully entitled to a place in that collection.

14. A brief Refutation of the Rev. Albert Borkowski's "Treatise concerning the Church, and the Mission of Ministers," in which he endeavours to rebut the Arguments of Socinus and Theophilus, and to defend Miedzybosz: by the aforesaid Theophilus Nicolaïdes. March, 1614. Racow, Typ. Sternacki, 4to. Some have thought that this, and the preceding work, were written by Volkelius; but they were both the undoubted productions of Smalcus. *Miedzybosz* and *Borkowski* were feigned names of Albert Rozciszewski, the Jesuit, who took the latter from his native town, Borkow, in Mazovia.

15. A Paper which Smalcus drew up in Conjunction with Jerome Moscorovius, and which contained Proposals for a Union of the Polish Brethren with the Mennonites. April 21st, 1612. *Polon.*

16. A Reply to a Book of Martin Smiglecus, the Jesuit, entitled, "Nova Monstra Novi Arianismi;" by Valentine Smalcus, of Gotha, Minister of the Church at Racow. 1613. Racow, Typ. Stern. 4to. This Reply was dedicated to the Senators of Thorn, Elbing and Dantzic. Bock acknowledges that Smalcus, though he had the wrong side to defend, had the advantage of Smiglecus in point of argument: yet Smiglecus, though conceited and domineering, was not an ill-informed Theologian. Some have thought, that he was born at Smigel; and that he derived his name of *Smiglecus* from that place: but he was a native of Reuschlemburg.

17. A Refutation by Valentine Smalcus of a Disputation concerning the Holy Spirit, held in the University of Jena, A. D. 1613, under the Presidency of Albert Graver, Doctor and Professor of Theology in that University. Racow, 1613, 4to. Reimannus admits, that, in this Refutation, Smalcus has made the worse appear the better cause.

18. A Reply to a Writing of Herm. Ravensperg, Minister and Professor of Theology at Steinfurt, entitled, “*Par unum Sophismatum Socinianorum ad Amussim Veritatis Examinatorium*,” &c., by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1614, 4to. Ravensperg professed to have vindicated John viii. 58, and x. 30, from the corruptions of the Socinians; but had given umbrage to not a few of the orthodox, by the violence of his attack. The reply of Smalcus, however, was not distinguished for its moderation. Ravensperg published, in the course of the same year, a defence of himself, under the title, “*Steinfurthi Vindicie SS. Trinitatis Mysteriorum*,” to which Smalcus immediately replied in the work to be next mentioned.

19. A Refutation of “*Theses concerning the sacred Unity of the divine Essence, and a Trinity of Persons in that sacred Unity, proposed by James Schopper, Doctor and Primary Professor of Theology at Altorf, A. D. 1613*,” to which is added a Reply to what Herm. Ravensperg has also adduced in a Paper, entitled, “*The Sacred Mystery of the Unity of the divine Essence in a Trinity of Persons, &c.*,” by Valentine Smalcus, Minister of the Church at Racow. 1614, 4to. Racow, Typ. Stern. A Dutch version of this appeared in 1664, 8vo.

20. A Refutation of the Theses of Albert Graver, Doctor of Theology, and Public Professor in the University of Halle, in which he has endeavoured to vindicate the Incarnation of the Eternal Son of God from the Attacks of our Churches; by Valentine Smalcus, of Gotha, Minister of the Church at Racow. 1615. Racow, Typ. Stern. 4to. The Theses of Graver were proposed in a disputation at Jena, in 1612; and his Vindication appeared at the same place in 1613, 4to.

21. Refutation of a Work of Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, entitled, “*The Word made Flesh*,” by Valentine

Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1614, 4to. This Refutation is dedicated to James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia, and is divided into twenty-eight Chapters, the subjects of which it would occupy too much room to specify in these pages. But they may be seen in Bock's "*Historia Antitrinitariorum*," T. I. P. ii. pp. 861, 862.

22. Refutation of the Theses of Wolfgang Franzius, Doctor and Public Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg, which he proposed there for Disputation on the principal Points of Christian Doctrine, in the years 1609 and 1611; written by Valentine Smalcus, of Gotha, Minister of the Church at Racow, in Little Poland; but published in 1614. Racow, Typ. Stern. 4to. This work is said to have been of such rarity in England, that Ashwell, in the Preface to his "*Dissertation on Socinus and Socinianism*," published in 1680, tells us, that he could not procure a copy of it, though he made diligent inquiry. At that time, the Socinians had their emissaries, and secret adherents, in most of the Protestant Universities of Germany, who sought to make converts to their faith. These persons forwarded to Racow all works, published against their party by the Calvinists, as soon as they appeared, in order that some one might prepare a reply to them; and about the time of which we are now speaking, it usually fell to the lot of Smalcus to do this. Franzius began to publish his "*Disputations on the Augustan Confession*," in 1609. In the preceding year, Smalcus had dedicated his German translation of the Racovian Catechism to the University of Wittenberg, which had given offence to that University, and excited the indignation of many. Franzius, therefore, in the work mentioned above, animadverted, with much learning and severity, upon it; so that this may be regarded as the first attack made upon the Racovian Catechism. The first Part of his "*Disputations*"

appeared at Wittenberg in 1609, the second in 1610, and the third in 1611, 4to. In 1611, the whole work was published at Leipzie; and in 1613 at Wittenberg. Smalcus's Reply appeared in 1614. It was divided into twenty-two parts; and treated upon all the principal points at issue between the Trinitarians and Unitarians.

23. Notes on a small Work of Martin Smiglecius, which he calls "A Refutation of the vain Attempt to untie his Gordian Knot." A. D. 1614, Racow, Typ. Stern. 4to. (Vide *Art.* 144, Nos. 1, 2.) The Dedication is signed A. R., the initial letters of the name *Andrew Reuchlin*, which Smalcus took from his mother's maiden name, Catharine *Reichin*, and under which he wished to lie concealed.

24. Exhortation to Isaac Casaubon, occasioned by his Reply to the Letter of Cardinal Perron: by Andrew Reuchlin. A. S. 1614, 4to. The title-page contains no mention of the place where this "Exhortation" was printed; but there is no doubt of its having issued from the press of Sternacki, at Racow. Conrad Vorstius's "Theological Treatise on God and his Attributes," printed at Steinfurt in 1610, was publicly burnt in England, in compliance with the advice and recommendation of Isaac Casaubon, in 1611, given in the aforesaid Letter, which was printed in 1612, both in a separate form, and in the Declaration of James I., King of England, addressed to the States-General of Holland, relating to the case of Vorstius. (Vide *Art.* 151.)

25. Dedication of the Commentary of Faustus Socinus on I John, inscribed to the Senators of Strasburg. 1614, Nov. 20th. This Dedication was reprinted in the Works of Faustus Socinus, T. I. p. 155.

26. An Examination of the Hundred Errors, which Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, has collected from the two

Parts of our Book, lately published against his “*Monstra:*” by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1615, 4to.

27. Ten Homilies upon the Introduction of John’s Gospel, delivered and written in the year 1605; to which is added a Paraphrase on that Introduction: by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, 1615, 4to. Typ. Stern. On this work Smalcus bestowed considerable labour. It was translated into Dutch by Doerck Raphaels Camphuysen.

28. Refutation of the Orations of John Vogel and Joachim Peuschel, in which they make a boast of having renounced Photinianism at Altorf, during the present Year: by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1617, 4to. The names of Vogel and Peuschel must be familiar to every reader of Zeltner’s “*Historia Crypto-Socin. Altorf.*” These two young men had been led to embrace the Unitarian doctrine; but were induced by the Divines of Altorf to return to the bosom of the Evangelical Church, and to make public recantations of their presumed errors, in the University of that city, which were printed at Nuremberg, in the year 1617. Zeltner has reprinted these recantations, in the above-mentioned work (pp. 890—933); to which he has subjoined the “*Refutation*” of them by Smalcus (pp. 938—997).

29. On the true Christ, and natural Son of God, One Book, opposed to that which Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, has published under the same Title; and a Refutation of a Work of the same Smiglecius, which he has entitled, “*On the Satisfaction of Christ for our Sins:*” by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1616, 4to. This volume is dedicated to Christopher Sieniuta, Heir in Lachowice, &c.; whom Smalcus congratulates, on his accession to the Socinian cause. It is also preceded by a General, and a Special Preface. The former Part, “*On the true Christ,*”

is divided into fifteen Chapters, the subjects of which may be seen in Bock's "*Hist. Ant.*" T. I. P. ii. pp. 873, 874. The latter, "*On the Satisfaction of Christ*," is divided into twelve Chapters, the subjects of which are also given by Bock (pp. 874, 875).

30. Refutation of a Disputation concerning the Person of Christ, which Albert Graver, Doctor of Theology, and Public Professor in the University of Jena, held there, A. D. 1612: by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1615, 4to.

31. Refutation of two Books of Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, which he has entitled, "*De Erroribus Novorum Arianorum*:" by Valentine Smalcus. Racow, Typ. Stern. 1616, 4to. This work is dedicated to the brothers Martin Czaplic Szpanowski, Lord of Hluponin, and George Czaplic Szpanowski, Lord of Kissielin. It is divided into two Books, of which the former consists of eighteen, and the latter of seventeen Chapters. The titles of these Chapters are all given by Bock (pp. 876—878); but it would occupy too much space to transfer them to these pages.

32. An Examination of the hundred and fifty-seven remaining Errors, which Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, has collected from the other two Parts of our Book, lately published, against the "*Monsters*" feigned by himself; together with a Refutation of what he has advanced in his Examination of the hundred former Errors: by Valentine Smalcus. 1616, 4to. This is a different work from the one mentioned under No. 26, with which John Fabricius has confounded it.

33. A Reply to a Book of James Zaborowski's, entitled, "*Fire and Water.*" Racow, 1619, 4to. This Reply is dedicated to Romanus de Hoszezo Hoseky; and relates to the union proposed to be formed between the Socinian

and Evangelical parties. The object of Smalcus is to shew, that in fundamentals there is no difference between the two parties; and that a friendly union between them is necessary, and will be productive of much advantage to the Evangelical party.

34. An Answer to two Pasquinades, lately published by the Evangelicals against those, who are unjustly called *Arians*; by an Elder of the Church, against which those Pasquinades were written. Racow, 1619, 4to. *Polon.* On the subject of the Trinity Smalcus says, "It is manifestly at variance with our opinion, that no mention should be made of the Holy Trinity, as far as by this is meant, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. For we were baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and are firmly persuaded, that no man can be a follower of Christ, and be saved, without being baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." He further says, "We therefore recommend and advise no man, to wish to free himself from a confession of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; for we ourselves are firmly resolved, by God's help, to remain steadfast in this confession to our latest breath."

35. The New Testament in the Polish Language. Racow, 1606, 8vo. That Smalcus assisted in the correction of this version, we learn from his own Diary, (p. 1181,) where he says, "On the 19th of February, 1606, Moscovius, Licinius and I met, to correct the Polish version of the New Testament; and after some weeks, by the divine blessing, happily finished it."

36. The New Testament in the German Language. Racow, 1630, 8vo. That Smalcus was employed in forming this version is evident from the allusions made to it in the Synodical Acts.

37. Against a Posthumous Work of Peter Skarga's,

entitled, "The Messiah of the Arians, according to the Turkish Koran." Racow, 1615, 4to. *Polon.*

38. A fuller and most accurate Explanation of the last three Chapters of Matthew. *MS.*

39. An Analysis and Explanation of John xvii. *MS.*

40. An Analysis of 1 Cor. *MS.*

41. A Sermon on Matthew xvi. 21—28. *MS.*

42. Various other Sermons. *MSS.*

43. A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Synod of Novogrodek, relating to the Controversy concerning the Invocation of Christ. *MS.*

44. An Autograph Diary of Smalcus's own Life, which Zeltner has appended to his "Historia Crypto-Socin. Altorf." (pp. 1158—1218); and which throws great light upon the history of Socinianism in Poland, and the neighboring countries, from the year 1572 to 1622.

45. *Adversaria*: principally historical. *MS.* Lubieniec mentions these "*Adversaria*," in his "*Hist. Ref. Pol.*" (L. iii. C. xi. p. 228); and from his notice of them, we find that they were different from Smalcus's Diary. Bock made very minute inquiries after this Common-place Book of Smalcus's, from Samuel and Paul Crellius; but was unable to learn into whose hands it fell, or what ultimately became of it.

46. *Acta Racoviensia*; or a History of the two Conferences held at Racow, March 7th, 1601, and Oct. 7—19th, 1602, at twenty-two Sitzings. *MS.* Sandius mentions these "Conferences," (B. A. pp. 174, 175,) and gives the names of the Ministers, Elders and Brethren, who attended them. Of the Conversations held in Smalcus's own house, an account was written by Matthew Radecius. (*Vide Art.* 102, No. 8.) These Conversations, or Theological Exercises, were begun on the 7th of January, 1606; they were interrupted, by the civil commotions in the Kingdom of

Poland, from the 22nd of February to the 28th of November, 1607; and the last of them was held on the 3rd of January, 1609.

47. A Letter to Conrad Vorstius, written at Racow, January 26th, 1614, inviting him to join the Polish Soci-nians. This Letter, together with Vorstius's Reply, declining the invitation, is inserted in "Letters Ecclesiastical and Theological of Excellent and Learned Men. Amst. 1660" (p. 414). They are also printed in "Letters of the Remonstrants, 1704," 4to. (N. 120, 121).

48. A Conference held at Gorlice, A.D. 1617, with Peter Lombard, Minister of the Reformed Church at Gorlice. This "Conference" is mentioned by Daniel Clemen-tinus, (*Antapologia*, p. 387,) and Smalcus thus describes it in his Diary. "On the 12th of May a Conference was held between us and the Evangelicals at Gorlice in the submontane country, not far from the confines of Hungary; Peter Lombard, (so called by his master, Christopher Krainski,) and I being the collocutors. There was a larger attendance of our people than of the Evangelicals. The chief of our party present were Messrs. Moscorovius, Starost of Philipovia; Morstinus; Stanislaus Lubieniecus; Rupnovius, and not a few others. On the part of the Evangelicals there were about twenty Nobles, but no one of eminence; four Ministers, besides the aforesaid Peter; the two Elders, Stancarus and Plachta; and one Procopius, Chaplain of Mr. Mecinius. The Conference went off most happily—. It lasted six hours." (P. 1207.)

49. A Funeral Discourse to the Memory of Mr. John Glinski, from John v. 25, delivered at Racow, A.D. 1620.

50. A Translation from Italian into Latin of Faustus Socinus's "Short Discourse on the Causes of a Belief or Disbelief of the Gospel." Racow, 1614, 8vo. (Vide Socini Opp. T. II. pp. 455—457.)

51. The Polemical Writings of Smalcius, in his Controversies with Smiglecus, Graver, and others. Racow, 1614, 4to. Bock had never seen this collection of the controversial works of Smalcius; and thinks it probable that it was not a reprint, but consisted of the polemical writings of Smalcius separately published, sets of which were collected, and bound up together in four volumes, with a new general title-page.

52. The Racovian Catechism. 1605, 12mo. *Polon.* Of this work Smalcius was one of the joint editors. The first notice which we find of his connexion with this Catechism is in his own Diary, April 25th, 1605, where he says, “Coëpinus Catechesin componere, Ego, Statorius, Moscorovius et Volkelius.” (Zeltneri Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. Suppl. p. 1179.) If what Sandius says may be relied on, the labour rested principally with Smalcius and Moscorovius; for that writer makes no allusion to Volkelius, in connexion with the preparation of this work for the press; and of Statorius he merely says, that he and Faustus Socinus had previously laboured upon it. (B. A. pp. 78, 100.) The Statorius here meant is Peter Statorius, Junior; and the reason why nothing further is said of him, in connexion with the authorship, or editorship of this Catechism, is, that he died about a fortnight after the preceding entry was made in Smalcius’s Diary. His death, indeed, is the very next event recorded. Perhaps it may admit of some doubt, whether the expression “Catechesin componere” implies the framing of an entirely new and original work, or the arranging and preparing for publication of previously existing materials. If the latter be its meaning, there may be an allusion to the materials collected by Faustus Socinus and Peter Statorius, of which something has been already said in the account of George Schomann. (Vide *Art.* 49.) As Statorius, after being associated with

Faustus Socinus, in the preparation of this Catechism, not six months before Socinus's death, was engaged in a similar undertaking with Smalcus and others about a year after that event, it seems natural to infer, that the Catechism published by Smalcus and Moscorovius was substantially the same as that, upon which Socinus and Statorius had previously laboured. Smalcus translated this Catechism from the Polish into the German, and published it in 1608, 12mo., under the following title. "Der Kleine Catechismus, zur Uebung der Kinder in dem Christlichen Gottesdienste." It was this version, which he dedicated to the University of Wittenberg, and upon which Wolfgang Franzius animadverted with so much severity, in his "Disputationes super Augustanam Confessionem, 1609—1611." The following

Brief Abstract of the Racovian Catechism,

expressed for the most part in the words of Dr. T. Rees's translation, will form no unsuitable close to the present article.

i. The Christian Religion is to be learned from the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament ; but especially from the latter. These Scriptures are authentic and credible, and are of themselves sufficient ; so that, in all things necessary to salvation, they alone are to be depended upon. These things are so plainly declared in many passages, that every one, who earnestly seeks after truth and piety, and implores the divine assistance, may understand them.

ii. Man is obnoxious to death, and could not of himself discover a way to avoid it, and one which should infallibly lead to immortality. The way of salvation, therefore, has been discovered to him by God ; and consists in the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ, whom he has sent.

iii. The knowledge of God consists in an acquaintance

with his nature, and his will. We must know that God exists; that he is one only; that he is eternal; and that he is perfectly just, wise and powerful. Again, we must know that he possesses an uncontrolled freedom of will; that he is omnipresent, infinitely good, and infinitely happy.

In the one essence of God, there is but one person; and this one divine person is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The essence of God is spiritual, and invisible.

By the will of God is not meant that faculty of willing which is naturally inherent in the Deity, but the effect of that faculty, particularly as regards those things which pertain to the Christian Religion, some of which were known before the coming of Christ, while others were revealed by him.

iv. The particulars concerning Jesus Christ, which the Christian ought to know, relate partly to his person, or nature; and partly to his offices.

He was by nature truly a man, but not a mere, or common man; because, even from his earliest origin, he was the only-begotten Son of God; because he was sanctified, and sent into the world by the Father; because he was raised from the dead by God, and thus, as it were, begotten a second time; and because, by his dominion, and supreme authority over all things, he is made to resemble, or equal God. But there is not in Christ a divine, as well as a human nature, or substance, although the Holy Spirit, which dwelt in him, was united, by an indissoluble bond, to his human nature. The Scriptures do not really ascribe to him eternal existence; or the names and works, which belong exclusively to the One God.

v. The offices of Christ consist in his being a Prophet, or the Mediator of the New Covenant; our High-priest; and our King.

His PROPHEPIC OFFICE consists in his perfectly

manifesting to us, confirming, and establishing the hidden will of God; and this will is contained in the New Covenant, which God has made with the human race through Jesus Christ, the Mediator. It comprises both the perfect precepts, and the perfect promises of God, together with the mode whereby, and the ground upon which we ought to conform to these precepts and promises.

1. The perfect PRECEPTS of God, comprised in the New Covenant, are in part included in the commands delivered by Moses, together with those which were added to them by Christ, and his Apostles; and in part contained in those, which were delivered exclusively by Christ and his Apostles.

The former comprehend all the moral precepts of the law, as enlarged by Christ, which are of two kinds, some general, and some particular, whereby the general are explained; and which are comprised in the Decalogue. Among other additions made to the First Commandment, we are required to acknowledge the Lord Jesus himself as one, who has divine authority over us, and in that sense as God; and are bound, moreover, to put our trust in him, and pay him divine honour. The other Commandments also have been enlarged and modified by Christ, and his Apostles.

2. The Commandments, which Christ has delivered separately from those of the law, are of two kinds; namely, those which relate to morals, and those which relate to external religious acts, or ceremonies.

The former relate, *first*, to religion, or mental devotion; *secondly*, to contempt of the world; and *thirdly*, to fortitude and patience.

3. The external religious acts, or sacred rites, always observed in the Church of Christ, are baptism, and the breaking of the sacred bread.

Baptism is a rite of initiation ; and adults only are the proper subjects of it. Men are not regenerated by this rite.

4. The breaking of bread is an institution of the Lord Christ, that believers in him should break and eat bread, and drink of a cup together, with the view of commemorating him, or of shewing forth his death ; which institution ought to continue to his coming. There is no stronger reason, why the Lord Jesus instituted this ordinance.

5. The greatest of all the PROMISES made by Christ is that of eternal life, in which are comprehended the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

By “the remission of sins” is meant, a free deliverance from the guilt and penalties of sins ; of which penalties some are temporal, and some eternal. Nor is the promise restricted ; for the remission of all sins is promised to us through Christ.

6. The Holy Spirit is not a person of the Godhead, but a virtue, or energy, flowing from God to men, and communicated to them ; whereby he separates them from others, and consecrates them to his service. It is promised to all believers in perpetuity.

7. Jesus has confirmed the divine will by the perfect innocence of his life ; by his great, and innumerable miracles ; and by his death.

8. His death was preceded by various afflictions ; and it was necessary, that he should suffer these afflictions, and undergo so cruel a death, *first*, because, by the divine will and purpose, he suffered for our sins, and underwent a bloody death, as an expiatory sacrifice ; and *secondly*, because those, who are to be saved by him, are, for the most part, obnoxious to the same afflictions and death. But in the business of our salvation, more depends upon the resurrection, than upon the death of Christ. Christ did not

die, in order, properly speaking, to purchase our salvation; and literally to pay the debt of our sins. The common notion on this subject is false, erroneous, and exceedingly pernicious. Not only are the Scriptures silent concerning any such purpose of Christ's death; but it is repugnant alike to them, and to right reason. Besides, it opens a door to licentiousness; or, at least, invites men to indolence in the practice of piety.

9. The way and manner, in which we are to conform both to the PRECEPTS and PROMISES of God, is by Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, which is of two kinds; meaning sometimes, the faith, which, unless something be added to it, is not attended with salvation; and sometimes, the faith, which is of itself followed by salvation. The latter includes Obedience, as well as Trust.

10. It is in our power to do the will of God, when strengthened by the divine aid, and by that filial spirit, with which, under the Gospel, we are endued, as adopted sons of God.

Adam was so created by God, as to be endowed with free will, which he did not lose by his fall; and it is certain, however we may define Original Sin, that the fall of Adam, as it was but one act, could not have power to deprave his own nature, much less that of his posterity.

Those who deny the freedom of the human will, do so, because they erroneously infer, from certain testimonies of Scripture, that it does not exist, in consequence of the Predestination and Election of God; or that it is expressly taken away, either from men in general, or from certain persons in particular.

11. The Justification, which we obtain by faith, is, when God regards us as just, or so deals with us, as if we were altogether just, or innocent; which he does in the New Covenant, in the forgiveness of our sins, and in con-

ferring upon us eternal life. None can be so justified, without faith in Christ. But this must be understood of the time after Christ had appeared; for though all, who have at any time believed in God, were justified through faith, yet they were not justified by faith in Christ, but simply by faith in God.

vi. The PRIESTLY OFFICE of Christ consists in this—that he not only offered up prayers and supplications to God, for himself and for us, while he dwelt on earth; but also sanctified himself, and gave himself as an offering for us, shedding his own blood for our sins: and thus, after being restored to life by God, and made immortal, he has, by his own blood, entered the holy, celestial place, and offered himself to God, appearing for ever in his presence, and interceding for us; by which one offering of his, he obtained, for all who believe in him, eternal redemption, and deliverance from their sins. These things are spoken of Christ by way of comparison, and likeness with the legal priesthood; but though the offering of Christ is so denominated by way of similitude, it has nevertheless a real, and a far more perfect sense, than sacrifices and offerings properly so called.

vii. The KINGLY OFFICE of Christ is to be considered in two points of view: *first*, as it respects his kingdom; and *secondly*, as it relates to his people, or subjects.

God having raised him from the dead, and taken him up to heaven, has placed him at his right hand; having given him all power in heaven, and on earth, that he might, at his own pleasure, govern, protect, and eternally save those who believe in him.

viii. The people, or subjects of Christ, are the Church, or society of Christians; which is either visible, or invisible.

1. The *Visible Church* is a society of such men as hold and profess saving doctrine; which society may be consi-

dered in general, and in particular:—In general, when all the visible societies of Christ, dispersed over the whole world, are considered as one society, or Church;—In particular, when every single society, existing in certain places, is taken for a Church of Christ.

2. The order prescribed to the Visible Church of Christ, is comprised in the offices of the persons, of whom the Church of Christ is composed; and in diligent watchfulness, and care, that every person discharges his own duties. It is the duty of some to govern, and of some to obey.

Those who govern are Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Teachers, Pastors or Bishops, Elders and Deacons. Apostles and Prophets are no longer to be found in the Church of Christ. The reason why they were chosen, sent, and given by God, no longer exists; whence they are called, by Paul, the foundation of the Church of Christ. Evangelists also have ceased; for they were chosen, together with the Apostles, for the promulgation of a new doctrine, which is now very old. The other offices continue, because the reasons of their appointment continue.

The duty of hearers, and of the young members of the Church of Christ, is to obey those who govern, in all things commanded by God; to communicate to those who teach in all good things; to count them worthy of double honour; and to receive no accusation against them, or against each other, but before two or three witnesses.

3. The way, in which the offices above mentioned are discharged, relates in part to all, but chiefly to those who rule. The unruly are to be corrected, either privately, or publicly: privately, as Christ directs, Matt. xviii. 15, 16; publicly, either by words or deeds.

4. The *Invisible Church* of Christ consists of those, who truly confide in Christ, and obey him: and are, therefore, in the most perfect sense, his body. An assembly, or con-

gregation of such men, we shall never see, but at the coming of Christ. At present it can only be conceived by the mind.

VIDEND. *Valent. Smalcii* Diarium, apud *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. Supplem. pp. 1158—1218. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 99—105. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 836—888. *And. Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. pp. 214, 215. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Alt. pp. 338—345. 938. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. pp. 459—468. *Cloppenb.* Opera Theolog. T. II. p. 509. *Rees's* Racovian Catechism, *passim*, Hist. Introd. pp. lxxviii—lxxxi. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Reform. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 369—371. 378—380, etc.

154.

BLASTUS was the Minister of Kieydany in Samogitia, and a contemporary and friend of Smalcius, who recognizes him as “a Brother.” But the Synodical Acts appear to make no mention of him.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 66. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1598, apud *Zeltner*, p. 1170.

155.

JOHN PIGELIUS was present at the Conferences, held at the house of Smalcius, at Racow, between the years 1606 and 1609. In 1613, he was sent as a colleague to Christopher Lubieniecicus, at the Church of Kostrow, and was then intending to devote himself to the instruction of youth: but in the year 1616, at the Synod of Racow, he declined sustaining the office either of a Minister, or a Schoolmaster, and looked out for some other employment. He seems to have been the same John Pigelius, who subscribed the decrees of the General Synod held at Thorn, in 1595, by which the “Consent of Sandomir” was confirmed. He was then called Pastor of the Church of Pirano; and belonged to the Evangelical party. But he afterwards joined the Socinians. Whether it was another Pigelius, and the son of this one, who, in 1641, was removed to the School at

Schleschink, by a decree of the Synod of Piaski, there seem to be no means of determining. Nor does it appear, that any other mention is made of this School elsewhere, in the Synodical Acts. It is stated in these Acts, that Pigelius submitted some Hymns of his own composition to the inspection of the Synod, held at Racow in 1616.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 632.

156.

JEROME MOSCOROVIVS, (*Polon.* MOSKORZOWSKI,) of MOSCORZOW, was a Polish Knight, of a very ancient and illustrious family, who joined the Socinians about the year 1595, or perhaps a little earlier. Faustus Socinus, in the Dedictory Epistle to his "Disputation with Erasmus Johannis," which is dated June 16th, 1595, and addressed to Jerome Moscorovivus, says, "It was a happy day, when our Church could look upon you as its own: for as you, from that time, despising the allurements of the world, and relinquishing its vain cares, have consecrated yourself wholly to the service of God and of Christ, and entered the path which leads directly to eternal salvation, from which you might else very easily have wandered; so our Church, enriched by the accession of such a man as yourself, may now with good reason expect, that other excellent men also, partly by your example, and partly by your care, may connect themselves with it." (*Socin. Opp. T. II. p. 491.*)

Jerome Moscorovivus was the father-in-law of Sbigneus Sieninius, and the son-in-law of Andrew Dudithius, whose daughter, Regina, became his second wife, on the 2nd of October, 1593. He held almost the first rank among the Socinians of his own time, and was the generous patron of their cause; for he not only extended over them the shield of his authority, but freely opened his purse to them, and hospitably entertained the Brethren who came from a dis-

tance. His wealth was as ample as his disposition was liberal, for he was the Lord of several manors; and he laboured, by his pen and his tongue, gratuitously, and out of a pure love of the truth, to disseminate those views, which, in his mind, were identical with the truth.

Moscorovius was also distinguished as a friend, and a cultivator of science. Faustus Socinus, writing to Ostorod, Feb. 17th, 1602, who was at that time labouring under a serious illness, recommended him to consult Moscorovius, whom he describes as “a man excelling no less in his knowledge of the science and practice of Medicine, than in virtue and piety.” (Opp. T. I. p. 450.) Moscorovius likewise took a great interest in the study of Chemistry. But after his conversion to Unitarianism, religion seems to have occupied the chief share of his attention.

He was sometimes called *Eusebius*, on account of his exemplary piety; and Ruarus, after speaking of him as the founder of the Church at Czarcow, and saying, that he was not more distinguished by his rank and erudition, than by his piety, adds, that he himself never met him at Racow, with Statorius and Crellius, but he returned home a wiser, and a better man. He was in the habit of attending regularly at the Synods; and took an active part in every scheme, which had for its object the welfare of the Unitarian body. He often attended the national Diet, as a delegate of the equestrian order; and, on the death of Socinus, whom he survived about twenty years, was perhaps the most influential individual among the Antitrinitarians of Poland. Sandius informs us, that he died on the 19th of July, 1625, (B. A. p. 105,) which, if we are to believe the continuator of Mierælius, (Hist. Eccles. p. 967,) is a misprint for 1629.

His opinions respecting the nature and person of Christ, and the honour due to him, coincided with those of Soci-

nus, and it seems probable that both took the same view of the doctrine of Satisfaction; for Moscorovius left in manuscript a reply to Grotius's work on that subject. He was associated with Smalcus in several literary undertakings. Moscorovius and Smalcus (vide Art. 153, No. 15) addressed a joint letter to the Mennonites of Dantzic, dated April 21st, 1612, recommending a union with them; and pointing out the method, by which the proposed union might be effected. Moscorovius also assisted Smalcus, and others, in translating the books of the New Testament into the Polish language; and was joint editor with him of the Racovian Catechism. But of these labours further notice will be taken, in the subjoined account of his writings.

1. The Address of a faithful Subject to the King and Senators; containing a short Reply to the Calumnies, levelled against those, who have devoted their Attention to the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and who affirm that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole God of Israël, and the sole Creator of Heaven and Earth. 1595.

2. A Reply to a Writing, entitled, "A Præmonition," which John Petricus, Priest, published in the year 1600. Racow, 1602, 4to. *Polon.*

3. The Removal of the Reproach, which Peter Skarga, the Jesuit, endeavoured to bring upon the Church of Christ. Racow, 1607. *Polon.*

4. Removal of the second Reproach of Peter Skarga, the Jesuit. 1610, 4to. *Polon.* This work was dedicated to Sigismund III., King of Poland. Skarga did not live to reply to it; but it was noticed by Martin Smiglecius, in the Appendix to his "Nova Menstra Novi Arianismi," to which Moscorovius published, by way of reply,

5. A Refutation of the Appendix, which Martin Smiglecius, the Jesuit, subjoined to his Book, entitled, "Nova Menstra Novi Arianismi:" by Jerome a Moskorzow Mos-

corovius. Racow, Typ. Sebast. Stern. 1613, 4to. This Refutation was dedicated by the author, from his seat at Czarcow, to John Tiliczki, Bishop of Cracow, and Duke of Severia.

6. Dedication of F. Socinus's "Disputation on the State of the first Man before the Fall," to Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse. 1610.

7. Reply to a Book of Gorscius, (or Gurski,) Popish Priest, entitled, "A Revelation of the Impudence of the Arians; written in 1611, and published in 1617. *Polon.*

8. A Paper addressed to the Mennonites of Dantzic. 1612. This, as before stated, was the joint production of Moscorovius and Smalcius.

9. A Letter to Martin Ruarus, written May 12th, 1613. (Vide Ruari Epp. Cent. ii. No. 34.)

10. Preface to F. Socinus's "Explanations of various Passages of Scripture." 1614. 1618, 8vo.

11. Refutation of Martin Smiglecus, the Jesuit's Book concerning Baptism; by Jerome a Moskorzow Moscorovius. Racow, 1617, 4to. The main object of this work is to refute Smiglecus's argument in favour of the Trinity, derived from the words of our Lord's baptismal commission to his disciples, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. Smiglecus had published at Cracow, in 1615, 4to., and again at Cologne, 1616, 4to., "A Book concerning Baptism, against Jerome Moscorovius, the Arian," directed against No. 5. To this "Book" the "Refutation" of Moscorovius was the reply: but the death of Smiglecus, in 1618, put an end to the controversy.

12. Preface to John Stoienski's "Disputation at Lublin with John Maria, a Carmelite Monk, July 13th, 1616, on the Divinity of Christ, and the Remission of Sins." Racow, Typ. Stern. 1618, 4to. (See under John Stoinius, *Art.* 201, No. 2.)

13. A Reply to Hugo Grotius "On the Doctrine of Satisfaction." *MS.*

14. Preface to Socinus's "Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount." Racow, Typ. Stern. 1618, 8vo.

15. Preface to Socinus's Work "Against Gabriel Eutropius." 1618.

16. Conference with Daniel Clementinus, Minister of the Reformed Church, on Jesus Christ the Son of God, held in 1618. Dan. Clementinus himself mentions this Conference; and says, that Moscorovius defended the following singular opinions:—That there are two kingdoms, one of the Father, and the other of Christ; that the faithful, meaning especially those who had embraced the doctrines of Socinus, constituted the kingdom of Christ; that the rest were subjects of the Father; and that neither had any right over the subjects of the other, except that the Son, from the perfect authority granted to him in heaven, and on earth, had the power of punishing the subjects of the Father, in case they injured or maltreated his Ministers in any way.

17. On the Controversy between Moscorovius and Smiglecius, "On uncreated Matter," which Moscorovius defended, but to which Smiglecius opposed this aphorism,—That every uncreated existence is necessarily infinite and unlimited, having nothing by which it can be limited,—the reader may consult Bayle's "Pensees diverses," &c., Opp. T. III. f. 347.

18. Moscorovius, as stated above, assisted in translating the Books of the New Testament into the Polish Language; and in composing

19. The Racovian Catechism. He also published

20. A translation of the Racovian Catechism into Latin, A. D. 1609, with a Dedication to James I., King of England. In this translation, he took the liberty of omitting,

adding and altering, wherever he thought it desirable. The title of it was, “Catechesis Ecclesiarum quæ in Regno Poloniæ et magno Ducatu Lithuanix, et aliis ad istud Regnum pertinentibus Provinciis, affirmant, neminem alium, præter Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, esse illum unum Deum Israël: Hominem autem illum Jesum Nazarenum, qui ex Virgine natus est, nec alium, præter aut ante ipsum, Dei Filium unigenitum et agnoscunt et confitentur. *Ante Annos quatuor Polonicè, nunc verò etiam Latinè edita.* Ose. 14, ult. Rectæ sunt Viæ Jehovæ, et Justi ambulant in eis: Prævaricatores verò corruent in eis. Racoviæ, Anno Domini, 1609,” 18mo. pp. 317. The annoyance, occasioned by the dedication of this Catechism to King James, is said to have been shewn, by a resolution of Parliament, ordering it to be publicly burnt. Walchius informs us, that authors disagree, as to the time when this happened; some referring it to the year 1653, and others to the year 1614. The truth is, that it met with this fate at two separate times. Isaac Casaubon, a contemporaneous writer, who had previously urged the burning of Vorstius’s “Treatise on God and his Attributes,” (Vide *Art.* 153, No. 24,) testifies, in the Dedication to his “Exercitationes in Annales Card. Baronii,” that the Latin translation of the Racovian Catechism was burnt in 1614. But Dr. Thomas Rees, (erroneously called *Abraham* Rees by Count Krasinski, Vol. II. p. 371,) has shewn, from the original Votes of Parliament, that a subsequent edition of it, published in London A. D. 1651, but bearing the imprint of *Racovia*, was burnt at the Exchange in London, and at the Palace-Yard in Westminster, in the month of April, A. D. 1652.

VIDEND. *Saulii* B. A. pp. 105, 106. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 511—521, 847. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1593, 1606, 1611. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. pp. 31, 168, 272—275. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 150. *Lubienicci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xii. pp. 241, 246.

D. Hartnacci Contin. H. E. Johan. Micælii, P. i. Art. i. p. 967.
Ruari Epist. Cent. ii. N. 17. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, p. 332.
Rees's Hist. Introd. to Racov. Catechism, pp. lxxviii—lxxx. *Walchi*
 Bibl. Theol. T. I. p. 537.

157.

PAUL SCHOMANN, the elder son of George Schomann, was born in 1562, and baptized when an infant; his father not having at that time rejected Pædobaptism. He acted as third Master of the School, or College, at Racow; and we learn from Smalcus, that he died in his fifty-sixth year, June 26th, 1617.

VIDEND. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1617. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 827.

158.

PETER SCHOMANN, the younger son of George Schomann, was born in 1574, and devoted himself to the study of Medicine, in which profession he attained to great celebrity. In the year 1596, he accompanied Peter Ostrowski in the Polish embassy to the Turkish Court; but no further particulars of his life appear to be known.

VIDEND. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1596. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 827, 828.

159.

SAMUEL WILKOVIVS, (*Polon.* WILKOWSKI,) was the scholar of Valentine Smalcus; but did not implicitly adopt all the opinions of his master. Socinus, in a letter written to John Balcerovicius, January 30th, 1581, mentions, in respectful terms, a person of this name, whom Bock supposes to have been the father of the subject of the present article. Smalcus, who states, that Samuel Wilkovius died of an epidemic fever, on the night of July 4th, 1599, speaks of him as "a contemner of the truth, of which," however, he admits that "he had some perception." This may mean nothing more, than that he adopted Unitarian views; but

did not fall in with the Socinian notions concerning the adoration of Christ. That Smalcus could speak in very harsh terms of those Unitarians, who denied that Christ was a proper subject of divine worship, we have already seen, in the account of Joseph Domanovius. (*Art.* 136.)

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1005. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1599, apud *Zelt.* p. 1169.

160.

PETER PRZYBYTOVICIUS, (*Polon.* PRZYBYTOWICZ), was Minister of Krupé, and died A. D. 1617. Sandius calls him *Peter Przybylovicius* (B. A. pp. 174, 175); but Smalcus, in his Diary, (Apud Zeltner, p. 1174,) evidently alluding to the same person, calls him "P. Przybylovius," and in another place "Peter Przybytowicz." (P. 1210.) He was present at the Conferences, held at Racow, March 7th, 1601, and October 7th, 1602. Of these Conferences Smalcus drew up an account, under the title of "*Acta Racoviensia.*"

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 174, 175. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 666, 667. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1601. 1617. *Art.* 153, No. 46.

161.

JOHN BAPTIST CETTIS, or CETIS, sometimes called, by his contemporaries *John Baptist* alone, without the addition of his surname, was an Italian, and a relative of Philip Buccella, the friend and host of Faustus Socinus. He was one of the first Moderators of the Gymnasium, erected at Racow, about the year 1600. Smalcus calls him the protector and patron of all foreigners; and Jerome Moscorovius speaks of him, in a letter to Martin Ruarus, dated Racow, 1613, as a pious and illustrious man. At his hospitable mansion, John Crellius first found a welcome, when he migrated to Poland. Joachim Pastorius, in his life of Crellius, informs us, that Cettis was a correspondent of

J. G. Leuchsner, a celebrated Jurist of Nuremberg. He opposed the Arian party at the Synod of Skrzynna. He was also present, as an Elder, or Brother, at the Conference held at Racow between the 7th and 19th of October, 1602. He died at an advanced age at Igolomia, three miles from the city of Cracow.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 175, 176. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 97. 1079; T. II. p. 696. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 368. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 34. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. p. 34. *Smalcii* Diarium, apud Zeln. p. 1199, A. D. 1613. *T. Crenii* Animadv. Philol. Hist. P. iv. p. 237.

162.

VALENTINE RADECIUS, (*Polon.* RADETZKI,) was the son of Matthew Radecius, and is designated by Zeltner “*Vir perquam facundus.*” He was known, among the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf, by the name of *Pancratius Eubulus*. There exists a letter of Faustus Socinus, written Nov. 23rd, 1603, and addressed to him as Pastor of the Church at Clausenburg, and Superintendent of the Unitarian Churches in Transylvania. In the latter office he succeeded Matthew Torotszkai, and he retained it till his death. He was a married man, and the father of a family; and when Socinus wrote the above-mentioned letter to him, Samuel Niecicius and Michael Gittichius were inmates in his house. In the month of October, 1605, he was appointed Pastor of the German, or Saxon Church at Clausenburg; but from some cause, which is unexplained, he left Clausenburg, and went to Racow, on the 31st of July, 1608, apparently with the intention of remaining there. At the entreaties of the Church, however, he was induced to return, and resume his ministerial functions at Clausenburg. He visited Racow again, on the 5th of March, 1612, a few weeks before his father’s death, at a time when there was a heavy fall of snow, which blocked up the roads, so as to render them,

for a time, impassable for travellers. Smalcus makes a special allusion to this in his Diary; but says, that Radecius returned to Transylvania before the thaw came on. At this time he was still Minister of the German, or Saxon Church at Clausenburg; and he retained this office to the time of his death, which happened in the year 1631. This we learn from the Manuscript Synodical Acts, in which it is stated, that the Senate of Clausenburg, some time in the course of that year, informed the Synod of Racow of his decease, and made application for some one to take charge of the Congregation over which he had presided.

He did not publish anything himself; but a few years after his death, appeared two small pieces by him, bearing the following titles.

1. A Form for the Administration of the Lord's Supper; to which is annexed an Answer to certain Questions, pertaining to the Elucidation of the same; and

2. A Morning and Evening Prayer. Both these were printed at Clausenburg, by George Abruigi, 1638, 8vo. Zeltner states, that the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, adopted in the above printed form, was similar to that, which had been practised by the Crypto-Socinians at Altorf.

3. It is mentioned in the Synodical Acts, that Radecius contemplated the composition of a work, to be entitled, "*Agendorum Ecclesiasticorum Syntagma*;" but it does not appear, that he lived to complete this undertaking. Peter Morsecovius afterwards wrote an elaborate treatise on the subject of Ecclesiastical Discipline, of which an account will be given in a subsequent part of the present work. *Art.* 238, No. 1.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 106, 107. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 709, 710, 950. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 302, 303. *Smalcii* *Diarium*, A. D. 1605, 1608, 1612. *Bibl. Fratr. Polon.* T. I. p. 492.

163.

SIMON PISTORIUS, a native of Oppeln, in Prussian Silesia, must be distinguished from *Simon Pistorius*, Chancellor of Saxony, who was born at Leipzig, Oct. 28th, 1489, and died at the close of the year 1562; and of whom Melchior Adam has published an account, in his “Lives of German Lawyers and Politicians.”

Our Simon Pistorius was Minister of a Church in the Tarnovian Mountains, at the same place where Daniel Franconius exercised the profession of a Schoolmaster, in whose conversion to Unitarianism he was instrumental, and who accompanied him, when he went to settle in Poland, in the year 1603. He had previously signified to the Synod of Racow his intention of emigrating to Poland; and had stated, that he and Daniel Franconius would shortly arrive in that country. The intelligence was received with joy by the Polish Brethren. Faustus Socinus himself addressed a letter to Pistorius, and sent him some books; at the same time advising him, by all means, to carry his intention into effect.

In the year 1604, soon after his arrival in Poland, he settled as Minister of the Church at Czarcow, where he remained many years. When, in 1638, he intimated a wish to the Synod at Kissielin, to remove to another situation, his request was not complied with; but Krzyskievicius was appointed his colleague, or assistant.

He married Rosina, the sister of Thomas Piscicius, a Silesian Noble; and was father-in-law to the celebrated John Crellius, whom he survived some years. He wrote

1. A Metrical Summary of the Contents of all the Chapters in the Bible;

2. An Ode upon Stanislaus Lubieniecicius, Senior; and

3. Other Poems, which remained in Manuscript.

4. He also wrote an account of a Conference, held at

Racow, February 24th, 1624, with Daniel Clementinus; and

5. Several Letters of his were preserved in the Baumgartenian Library.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 107. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 633. 642—644.

164.

DANIEL FRANCONIUS, (called FRANCKIUS in the Synodical Acts,) according to Zeltner, took his surname from Franconia, which is supposed to have been his native country. Smalcus in his Diary, under the date, July 18th, 1609, calls him his very dear brother in the Lord, an industrious man, and his scholastic colleague; meaning his fellow Teacher in the Gymnasium at Racow. Lubieniecius also describes him as a very celebrated poet, and a pious man.

Zeltner was ignorant of the occasion, which brought Daniel Franconius into Poland, and induced him to become a member of the Socinian Church. But Bock ascertained, from the Synodical Acts, that he was formerly Rector of a School, in the same place in which Simon Pistorius officiated as Minister, in the Mountains of Silesia, near Tarnowitz; and that he was converted to Unitarianism by Pistorius, whom he afterwards accompanied, on his removal into Poland, in 1603.

About the year 1609, he was appointed a Teacher and Collaborator in the School at Racow. After this he seems to have filled some other office, probably that of Scribe, or Copyist to the Synod; for in 1619, he was directed to send to Racow, with as little delay as possible, a neatly written copy of Volkelius's large work, "*De Vera Religione*," (vide Art. 144, No. 3,) and this task he seems to have completed in a satisfactory manner.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 365. 999. *Smaleii* Diar. A. D. 1609, apud Zeltner. p. 1185. *Lubieniecii* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xii. p. 249.

165.

THOMAS PISECIUS, (*Polon.* PISECKI,) of Martowitz, is called by some *Piasecius*, but must not be confounded with the Polish family of *Piasecius*, of whom *Paul* was celebrated for his "Chronicles," published at Cracow, A. D. 1643. In Walchius's "Bibliotheca Theologica," Thomas Pisecius is reckoned among the number of *German Socinians*. He was not a Pole, but a Silesian. For many years, however, he lived in Poland; and in some of his published works he calls himself "Pisecki."

He was one of those, who frequented the Conferences held in the house of Smalcus at Racow, between the years 1606 and 1609. Zeltner calls him the greatest patron of the Crypto-Socinians at Altorf; and tells us, that he was known among them by the name of *Martius Piso*. He was a man of varied learning; remarkably skilful in conversation and debate; and zealous in defending his own religious views, which were strictly Socinian.

It was through his acquaintance with Crellius, that Pisecius became connected with the Socinian party. Sandius and Bock were unable to learn the particulars of his birth and death; but the former ascertained, from those who knew Pisecius, that he was living till near the middle of the seventeenth century, and was then about seventy years of age. This account is confirmed by the Synodical Acts, which testify that, in 1630, he was requested, at the Synod of Racow, to print something. Five years later than this, a written request was made to him by the Synod, that he would prepare some work for the press. In 1640, he is called an old man. At that time an allowance was granted to him by the Synod at Kissielin; and the Acts state, that his debts were paid out of the funds of the Church. They also mention his son, to whom an exhibition was granted,

by a vote of Synod, for the purpose of enabling him to study the Law.

We learn, from the Dedicatory Epistle to one of his works, that Thomas Pisecius had a brother, named *Martin*, who was a Doctor of Philosophy and Medicine. (Vide infra, No. 3.) He also had a sister, named *Rosina*, who has already been mentioned, as the wife of Simon Pistorius. (Vide Art. 163.) The following is a list of his writings.

1. An Answer to the Ten Reasons of Edmund Campianus, the Jesuit, to prove that the Catholic Church is to be preferred to all others. Typ. Stern. Racow, 1610, 12mo. Pisecius dedicated this Answer to James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia. The work of Campianus, to which it was a reply, was published in England, and dedicated to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

2. On the Origin of the Trinity. The manuscript of this treatise perished by fire, some time between the years 1590 and 1604.

3. Is the Doctrine of the Trinity a Mystery, hidden from before all Worlds, which ought to become known to Men by the Revelation of the Divine Word? 1605, 8vo.; 1608 and 1654, 12mo. This is a part of the preceding treatise, which having been copied out before the fire consumed the original, escaped destruction. It is dedicated by the author to his brother Martin. The last reprint of it was in a very scarce volume, entitled, “Fausti et Lælii Socini, item Ernesti Soneri, Tractatus aliquot Theologici, nunquam antehac in Lucem editi. Eleutheropoli, 1654,” 16mo. In this volume it occupies the sixth, and last place.

4. On Antichrist. Two Books, 8vo. This was published under the feigned name of *Marcus Camillus*, without any notification either of time or place; and has been incorrectly ascribed by some to Jonas Schlichtingius, and by others to Elias Arcissevius, Jun. That Pisecius was himself

the author of it Sandius affirms, not only on the ground of common report, but because he was able to verify that report by consulting the friends and relations of Pisecius.

5. Against Leonhard Less, the Jesuit. Bock, who was not able to give the exact title of this work, supposes it to have been a reply to Less's treatise, "On the Incarnation of the Word."

6. A Guide to the Peace of the Church. Eleuthropolis; printed by Godfr. Philadelphus. 1650, 8vo. This work was really printed at Amsterdam, by the brothers, John and Cornelius Blaeu. It was published under the assumed name of JOSEPHUS CASTIM, the letters of which, by transposition, as Bock says, form the sentence PACIS EST OSTIUM. But that writer seems not to have been aware, that it is also the anagram of THOMAS PISECIUS, the author's real name.

7. A Treatise on Simon and Simoniacs, is mentioned in the Synodical Acts, as being under revision in the year 1637, together with other writings of Pisecius, which have never seen the light.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 107, 108. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 633—642. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Soc. Altorf. p. 295. *Walchii* Bibl. Theol. T. I. p. 920.

166.

ADAM GOSLAVIUS, (*Polon.* GOSTLAWSKI,) of Bebeln, a Polish Knight, was a pupil of Nicholas Taurelli, and one of the most distinguished among the Socinians for his erudition. There were two brothers of the name of *Goslavius*, Adam and Andrew, who belonged to the higher rank of Polish Nobility, and distinguished themselves by their advocacy of the opinions of Socinus. Lubieniecus speaks of the splendour of their family, both on the father's and mother's side; and describes them as remarkable for their courtesy and moderation, and much beloved by those of

their own rank, who were otherwise most hostile to the truth. But Adam acquired considerable reputation by his writings, and particularly those in defence of his religious opinions; on which account the Crypto-Socinians at Altorf were accustomed to call him *Diocles*. Zeltner seems rightly to suspect, that the origin of this name is not to be sought among any of the eminent Physicians and Philosophers of Greece, whose distinguishing appellation it was; but from the surname of *Goslavius* himself, which, put into a German form, would be *Gottslow*, equivalent to the Greek *Διὸς κλέος*, *the glory, or praise of God*.

Of the particulars of the life of Adam Goslavius, Sandius has said nothing. Nor has Lauterbach made any mention of him, probably because he was not acquainted with any of his writings, which are very difficult to be met with. He was descended from the family of Szczepanowski. His mother, whose Christian name was Dorothea, belonged to the ancient and illustrious family of Philipowski. He married the widow of Cyril Taszycki; and for a time held the estate at Luclavice, in right of his wife.

Being a person, whose name carried great weight with it, Adam Goslavius attached his signature to a letter, interceding for Ruarus with the Senate of Dantzic. He seems to have held no public office, except perhaps that of Secretary to the King; for in the Synodical Acts, under the year 1608, mention is made of some one of the name of Adam, who is designated "Secretary," and this person Bock supposes to be Adam Goslavius.

In his Preface to the Reader, prefixed to his work against Bartholomew Keckermann, he says, "I am no Theologian, or Philosopher: I assume neither of these characters." Yet Zeltner says, that he was wonderfully given to philosophical speculations; and calls him, "nomiatissimus acerrimusque Socinismi defensor."

He spent the greater part of his life on his paternal estate, called *Krassow*, which was the joint property of the two brothers, and situated not far from the village of *Lyclavice*, that famous seat of Socinianism, where *Faustus Socinus*, after being driven by persecution from *Cracow*, found an asylum under the hospitable roof of *Abraham Blonski*, and at which place he died.

From the Preface to his “*Refutation of Keckermann*,” which was published by the advice of his friends and fellow believers, we learn that the literary pursuits of *Goslavius* were suspended for eight years; and that it was customary, in *Poland*, for young men of noble birth like himself, to discontinue their studies when they left school. This custom he does not attempt to justify. He simply states the fact, as regards himself, and other young persons of the same rank in life; that they very rarely continued their studies till they were twenty, and that, beyond this age, there was scarcely one studious man to be found among the *Polish Nobility*; that a great part of their time was unprofitably spent; and that all, without exception, were employed in civil or military affairs, or at Court. Having mentioned this, and applied the remark to himself, he hints, in no obscure terms, that, at the time of his publishing the work above alluded to, he had not attained his thirtieth year, thus leaving the reader to infer the disadvantageous circumstances, under which it was written.

In 1638, when seven Curators and Directors of the Socinian body were appointed at the Synod of *Kissielin*, *Adam* and *Andrew Goslavius* were among the number; a proof of the high estimation in which they were held, by those of the same faith. The exact time of the deaths of these two excellent men is not known. But that *Adam* was living after the year 1640, we learn from the *Epistles of Ruarus*; and his influence, instead of declining, increased

as he grew older. It is said, that John Crellius never undertook anything without consulting him.

In the Synodical Acts, A. D. 1648, mention is made of one Stanislaus Goslavius, who was at that time appointed to the office of Church Deacon; but it is not known in what relation he stood to Adam and Andrew.

The principal work of Adam Goslavius is,

1. A Refutation of what Bartholomew Keckermann has advanced, in his "Theological System," against those who confess, that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ alone is the God of Israël; and that there is no other Son of God beside, or before him, who was born of the Virgin Mary. Racow, 1607, 8vo. This work came to a second edition in 1613, 8vo. Racow. Both editions issued from the press of Sebastian Sternacki. Bock remarks, that few persons in his time had seen either edition; particularly the former. This rare work, a copy of which is now lying before the writer, is dedicated to the Senate of Dantzic, where Keckermann lived. The Dedication is followed by a Preface to the Reader. The body of the work consists of Three Parts. The First Part, in which the author professes to refute the arguments, alleged from reason and Scripture in favour of the Trinity, is divided into Five Chapters. In the Second Part, which contains Ten Chapters, the author defends certain objections to the Doctrine of the Trinity, which had been attacked by Keckermann. In the Third Part, which also consists of Ten Chapters, he treats upon the word *Person*. Of this last Part James Martini, a Professor in the University of Wittenberg, undertook the refutation, in a work entitled, "De tribus Elohim."

2. Another work of Adam Goslavius, more rarely to be met with still than the former, is, A Disputation concerning the Word *Person*; in which the writer defends, against the attacks of James Martini, what he had said in the Third

Part of his former work. This was also printed by Sebastian Sternacki at Racow, 1620, 8vo.; and as a proof of its extreme rarity, it has been observed, that Lubieniecus was not aware of its ever having been printed, supposing that the manuscript had been lost, through the carelessness of a friend. A remark to this effect has been made, and repeated by Zeltner: but it arose from a misconception of the words of Lubieniecus, who alluded, not to the treatise under consideration, but to a still more elaborate work on the same subject. Vogt, who points out the error of Zeltner, expressly states, that he is himself in possession of a copy of the “Refutation of Keckermann,” and the “Disputation on the Word *Person*.” (Catal. Historico-Crit. Libr. Rarior. p. 313.) The following are the titles of other writings of Adam Goslavius.

3. An Answer to James Ostrowski’s Defence of Peter Skarga’s Sermon on the Trinity. Racow, 1608. *Polon*.

4. A Reply to Andrew Kesler’s Examination of the Photinian Metaphysics. *MS*.

5. Philologica.

6. In the year 1627, a resolution was passed, commissioning Adam Goslavius to write a book, “On the Forms of Church Government;” but whether he carried out this resolution, either wholly or in part, is doubtful. If he began such a work, it is probable that he made no great progress in it; and it is certain that he never brought it to a conclusion.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 108. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 404—413. Hist. Socin. Pruss. § vii. p. 16. *Lubieniecii* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xv. pp. 273, 274. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 229—231. 271. *Vogt*, Catal. Libr. Rar. l. c.

167.

ANDREW CHRASTOVIUS, (*Polon*. CHRZASTOWSKI, or CHRZONSTOWSKI,) was a Polish Knight, and Aulic Coun-

cillor to the King of Poland, who left the Evangelical party, and joined the Unitarians. He was the author of the following writings.

1. A Dialogue between an Evangelical Noble, and an Evangelical Minister. 1618, 4to. In this Dialogue, which was written in the Polish language, the author treats on the discipline and rites of the Evangelical Church, from which he had seceded, and to which he refused to return, till these were amended. A reply to this Dialogue was published by the Ministers of the Evangelical Church in the following year; and was attributed to Grzybowski, an Elder of that Church.

2. A Defence of Andrew Chrastovius, against the Preachers and Ministers of the Evangelical Denomination, in the District of Lublin. July 31st, 1619, 4to. *Polon.*

3. A Letter addressed to the Synod of Lublin, refusing to obey the Summons to attend that Synod.

4. A Letter of Expostulation respecting the Cavils of the Evangelical Ministers, addressed to the Synod of Ozarow, in 1617.

5. A Letter addressed to Zurowski, Evangelical Minister of Belzyce, in the year 1618, defending his own conduct in absenting himself from the approaching Synod. The reader will probably recollect, that the last attempts to form a union between the Socinians and the Evangelicals were made at the Synods of Ozarow and Belzyce. (Vide Art. 153.) Chrastovius, it would seem, declined taking any part in the Conferences, held on those occasions, between the Evangelical and Socinian parties.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 108. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 98, 99.

168.

MICHAEL GITTICHIVS, commonly called VENETIANUS, was the son of an Italian emigrant, who settled in Poland,

in the reign of Sigismund Augustus; and married a Polish, or Lithuanian lady. Faustus Socinus, in a letter to Valentine Radecius, A. D. 1603, calls him *Gutichius*; and A. Dinner, writing to Zeltner in 1609, says, that Michael Gittichius was the son of a German, of the name of *Matthias Güttich*. This statement, however, is incorrect; as also are those of Lauterbach and Lamy, who make Michael Gittichius a Venetian. In his correspondence with his friends, it is true, Gittichius frequently omits his own surname, and subscribes himself *Venetianus*, Venice having been the native city of his father; but this was evidently because he was proud of his Italian descent, and anxious to disclaim any relationship with the German family of *Güttich*.

He states, in a letter addressed to Martin Ruarus, and in another addressed to Nicholas Harder, that he did not receive his heterodox impressions from his father, who seems never to have deserted the orthodox faith, on the subject of the Trinity. The change in his own views was entirely the result of personal inquiry; and what first led him to entertain doubts concerning the commonly received opinions, was, as he himself states, the unmeaning, frivolous, contradictory and absurd things, which he found in the writings of the Fathers, and in those of modern Catholic and Protestant authors.

He received the rudiments of his education at Kokliow; and, in his nineteenth year, ventured to engage in a dispute concerning Purgatory, with a Catholic Priest of no ordinary attainments, whom he succeeded, after a long and close discussion, in convincing of his error. After this, he lived, for some time, with Valentine Radecius, at Clausenburg; and having extended the range of his acquirements, and strengthened the foundations of his faith, under that eminent teacher, he returned into Poland at the close of

the year 1603, when he was appointed one of the Tutors in the College at Racow.

On the 10th of December, 1607, according to Zeltner, he went to the University of Altorf, accompanied by a young Polish Nobleman, of whose education he had the charge; and who was the son of John a Woinarowa Woinarowski. He probably made choice of this University, in consequence of the high terms, in which he had heard his friends Ostorod and Voidovius speak of it, and the high character which it had attained, as a place of education; and it was no doubt an additional recommendation to him, that Ernest Sohner at that time held the office of Rector. During his residence at Altorf, he made many converts to Unitarianism; till at length, about the beginning of the year 1610, having become known to the Curators, as a man devoted to heresy, and bent upon doing all in his power to propagate it, he received a peremptory command to quit the town.

From Altorf, Gittichius went to Ingolstadt, where, for some time, he pursued the same zealous course. But in the month of September, 1611, he was ordained to the ministerial office, in a Synod held at Racow. From this time, as he writes to his friend Sohner, he had the charge of a small congregation of Unitarians, near Novogrodek, in Lithuania, on an estate belonging to Raphaël Kosi, a Polish Nobleman.

In 1614, it was determined, that he should be recalled from Lithuania, where it was thought there was not sufficient scope for his talents, and appointed to take charge of some congregation in Poland, in which country a wider field would lie open before him. But the Lithuanian Churches, and especially that of Novogrodek, requested that he might be allowed to stay longer with them; and their request was granted. At this time, he was in the

habit of going from his residence in the country to Novogrodek, and publicly teaching Unitarianism there, in conjunction with his colleague, John Licinius. But in 1618, they were both prohibited, by royal authority, from exercising their ministerial functions any longer in that place. Gittichius, however, continued to profess his opinions on his patron's estate, and in the neighbourhood of the town; and remained there a great number of years. From the subscriptions of two letters, written by him to Ruarus, in 1642, it appears, that he was still acting as Chaplain to Raphaël Kosi, and employed in conducting the religious services of a small congregation of Unitarians, which he calls "My Little Church."

He married a widow with a family of six children, and by her had one son, whom the Synod of Czarcow, in 1642, resolved to take under its own care; and who, in 1644, was admitted, by the Synod of Siedliski, among the number of Alumni, or Students for the ministry.

Gittichius was maliciously and falsely charged, by the Jesuits, on one occasion, with publicly praying for the success of Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden. Lubieniecivs, in relating the particulars of this vile calumny, speaks of him in the highest terms, as the faithful Pastor of the Lithuanian Churches, a very learned and excellent man, and a much admired Preacher.

He died, as Sandius informs us, in the year 1645, after having done all in his power, both by his preaching and his writings, to promote the spread of the Unitarian doctrine. Albert Graver calls him "a most acute Photinian;" and he is allowed, on all hands, to have been an able defender of the Unitarian faith, though he sometimes maintained his opinions in too dogmatical and confident a manner. Zeltner remarks, that he sketched the outline of an Index of names and terms, under which the Socinians

concealed the persons and things connected with their body; or, at least, that he suggested the plan of such an Index. The same writer has inserted, in his "History of Crypto-Socinianism," (C. ii. Sect. ii. pp. 153—157,) a copy of this Index, from the "Homonymoscopia" of John Möller, amplified by much supplementary matter. It never came into extensive use among the Socinian body, but was familiarly known to those of the Students in the University of Altorf, who had embraced the opinions of Socinus, and among whom caution and secrecy were necessary. The following is a translation of this curious document.

A. Altorf: *Pancomium*.—Anabaptists: *Badenses*.—Arminius (James): *Talæus*.—Arminians: *Protestantes*.

B. Batavi (or Dutchmen): *Hesperii*.—Bentheim (Count): *Frutestini Comes, vel Dominus*. [N. B. *Frutestini*, as Zeltner intimates, is the anagram of *Steinfurti*.]—Belgium: *Glebium*.—Bertius (Peter): *Pogonatus, or Philosopho-Theologus*.

C. Calvinists: *Phalantii*.—Cobus (John): *Onesimus, Hilpershusanus, or Bocius*.—Communists: *Pythagorici*.—Cornelius: *Lonicerus*.—Cracow: *Fragosia*.—Crellius (John): *Solinus, Leniancer, or Helmezheimensis*.

D. Dantzie: *Orchestra*.—Davidis (Francis): *Liberius Erasmus*.—Dümmler: *Tyrbæus, or Mulderus*.

E. Enyedi (George): *Monavius*.—Engelbert: *Angelus Berticus*.—Episcopius (Simon): *Horatius*.

F. Fabricius (John George): *Schmidlinus, or Philiatrus*.—Franeker: *Eleutheria*.—Franzius (Wolfgang): *Gallus*.—Frauenburg (John Gerhard): *Magdeburgus, or Fæminarius noster*.—Fratres cœtus Unitarii recens natus (or a recent convert to Unitarianism): *Rivalis noster*.—Führer: *Pompeius*.

G. Gaul (or France): *Liberia*.—Germany: *Andria*.—Gittichius (Michael), Venetianus: *Clementinus*.—Gosla-

vius (Adam): *Diocles*.—Graver (Albert): *Canus*, and *Theologus disputax*.

H. Hague (The): *Locus in quo Sylvanus auditur*.—Hainlin (John James): *Dominicus*, or *Galliculus*.

I. Isanadius: *Odontius*.

J. Jena: *Oenome*.—Jesuits (The): *Nigri*.—Johannis (Erasmus): *Desiderius Ulricus*.

K. König (George): *Regius*.

L. Leuxner (or Leuchsner): *Luceius*, or *Xenuleius*.—Leimer: *Collectus*, or *Meilerus*.—Lithuania: *Classivania*.—Lubbert (Sibrand): *Theologus inquietus*, and *Titius*.—Lucius: *Lupus*.—Lugdunum Batavorum (or Leyden): *Guldunum*, or *Pathmus*.—Lutherans: *Puritani*.

M. Marks (Cornelius): *Carmus* (Qu. *Carmi*?).—Martini (James): *Philosophus disputax*.—Maurice (Prince, of Nassau): *Dominus bellicus peritissimus*.—Maurice (Landgrave of Hesse): *Princeps cujus patrocínio Antiboccius commissus*. [N. B. Zeltner discovered, after he had printed this list, that Möller, through mistake, had read *Antiboccius* instead of *Anti-Puccius*, p. 273.]—Mennonites: *Docetæ*.—Moscovius (Jerome): *Eusebius*, and *Medicus Nobilis*.

N. Nuremberg: *Salamantica*.

O. Ostorod (Christopher): *Paschasius*, or *Paschalodus*.

P. Pope (The): *Saturnus*.—Papists: *Patricii*.—Penschel (Joachim): *Strabo*, or *Scheulepius*. [N. B. Möller had printed *Schrilepius* by mistake. Zeltner corrects the error, p. 287.]—Photiniana Religio (the Photinian, that is, the Unitarian Religion): *Felicitas*.—Photinianæ religioni addicti (Photinians, or Unitarians): *Felicitatis amatores*, and *Lucenses* [a word derived from *Lux*, as Photinus is from Φῶς, *Light*].—Piccart (Michael): *Niger Philosophus*.—Planer: *Delius*, or *Lapnerus*.—Pisecius (Thomas): *Martius Piso*.—Poland: *Campania*, or *Nolopia*.—Polonus (a Pole): *Nolopus*.

R. Racow: *Verona*, or *Covaria*. [N. B. Möller has *Cavaria*, an evident mistake for *Covaria*, the anagram of *Racovia*. Vide Zeltner, p. 298.] Radecius (Valentine): *Pancratius Eubulus*.—Ravensperger (Hermann): *Sylvani Successor* [that is, *the successor of Conrad Vorstius*].—Rhaw (Matthias): *Carcharias*.—Reudenius (Ambrose): *Facultatis Theologicæ Senior*.—Richter (George): *Critius*, or *Prætorius*.—Rostoch: *Rhodus*, or *Storochium*.—Ruarus (Martin): *Aretius Crispicus*, or *Martinus noster*.—Ruarus (Joachim): *Dominicus Anastasius Crispicus*.

S. Sartorius [a probable mistake for *Statorius*], (John): *Hormius Histæus*.—Schopper (James): *Senex vester*.—Seidelius: *Heiminæus*, or *Pomeranus noster*.—Sigismund III., King of Poland: *Victorius*.—Smalcius (Valentine): *Butyrius*, or *Andrew Reuchlinus*.—Smiglecus (Martin): *Gelasius*.—Socinus (Faustus): *Turpilio*, or *Beatus Turpilio*.—Sommer (John): *Therinus*.—Solmer (Ernest): *Philetus*.—Steinfurt: *Petra*, or *Frustenum*.

T. Timpler (Clement): *Hiero*, or *Sylvani Collega*.—Transylvanians: *Hylæi*.

V. Vogel (John): *Johannes Avitus*.—Volkelius (John): *Popilius*, or *Populæus*.—Vorstius (Conrad): *Sylvanus*, or *Trasybulus Sylvius*.

W. Wittenberg: *Arges*.

Zeltner enters into a long and learned discussion concerning the derivation of these names, and is generally successful in tracing them to their source. Some of his etymologies will be found in different parts of the present work, which supersedes the necessity of dwelling upon the subject in this place. The reader, however, who is curious to see in what manner these feigned names were applied by the Crypto-Socinians, in their correspondence with each other, will probably be interested by the following extract from a letter, addressed by Martin Ruarus to Joachim

Peuschel, A. D. 1616. "Incidī nuper in bonos quosdam viros, quos Badensium" [viz. Anabaptistarum] "nomine sæpius in cassum quæsiveram, qui de Deo, personâ officioque Christi, de cœnâ Domini, de baptismo, aliisque religionis partibus, quarum mentionem feceram, idem cum Campanis" [Polonicis] "amicis sentiunt, licet eorum propemodum ignari, homines alias simplices, et pietatis valde studiosi: * * * interrogati, unde opiniones huic cœlo tam inusitatas ipsi imbibissent, responderunt, se post accuratam quorundam scripturæ locorum examinationem, ardentesque preces, Bernhardi cujusdam, fabri quondam ærarii, quem ab Helvetiis fratribus inquisitorum metus huc egerat, operâ plurimum profecisse, habuisse etiam nescio quid libri Veronæ," [Racoviæ,] "formis descripti, Smigliâ fortassis allati, et propterea Martianos" [?] "a nonneminē vocatos esse, quod convitium ipsi tamen nequaquam agnoscerent, tutiore Badensium" [Anabaptistarum] "nomine contenti. Dedi ipsis legendas Paschasii" [Ostorodi] "institutiones et catechesin Veronensem," [Racoviensem,] "ut tanto melius, si quid nostrum improbaverint, cum illis agere possim." (Ruari Epp. Cent. ii. N. ix.) The letter, from which the above passage is extracted, purports to have been written at "Platææ," by which, as Zeltner conjectures, (p. 173,) the city of Strasburg is meant. But perhaps we have delayed too long upon this subject. The present article, therefore, will be brought to a suitable conclusion, by the following list of the writings of Gittichius.

1. Common-places from all the Writings of the Unitarians, arranged in Alphabetical Order. This was a Folio Manuscript, and is mentioned in the Acts of the Assemblies of Raszców and Czarcow, under the title, "Venetiani Promptuarium Theologicum."

2. Letters mentioned by Albert Graver in the Preface

to his "Examination of the principal Sophisms employed by the modern Photinians in the Explanation of Heb. i." These Letters were published by Ludwig Lucius at Basil in 1613, as will be seen in the next No.

3. On that highly important Question, Whether or not Christ made a Satisfaction for our Sins to Divine Justice? a scholastic and epistolary Controversy between Michael Gittichius and Ludwig Lucius. This work went through three editions; of which the first and second were published at Basle, in 1613 and 1621, 12mo.; and the third in 1628, 8vo. Gittichius wrote a distinct work against Lucius and Graver, which seems not to have been published, because he would not consent to certain erasures and alterations, recommended by Moscorovius, Goslavius and Smalcus, who had been commissioned by the Synods of Lublin and Racow, in 1611 and 1612, to revise it, with a view to publication.

4. Explanations of various Passages of Scripture, and Sketches of Sermons, for the Use of Students in Divinity; begun Feb. 3rd, 1640, and finished March 25th, 1641. *MS.*

5. A Letter concerning Christ, Whether he now has the same numerical Body which he had upon Earth; dated Novogrodek, Nov. 16th, 1613, and addressed to John Crellius. In this Letter, which is inserted in the Works of Crellius, (*Bibl. Fratr. Pol. Vol. IV. p. 538,*) Gittichius ingeniously argues against the received Socinian doctrine on this subject.

6. A Sermon from Psalm cxlvi., delivered Jan. 16th, 1615. Typ. Pet. Blastus, 4to. Wilna, or Novogrodek.

7. An Index of Secret Names commonly employed by the Unitarians for disguising the proper Names of Persons and Places; enlarged by Joachim Peuschel.

8. A Letter to Martin Ruarus concerning Grotius's Commentary on Passages in the New Testament, relating

to Antichrist; written Nov. 10th, 1642, and inserted in "Ruarus's Epistles," Cent. i. No. 61.

9. Another Letter to Ruarus on Grotius's Explanation of three very useful Passages of the New Testament, &c.; written Nov. 17th, 1642. Cent. i. No. 63.

10. Another on Fasting, written July 15th, 1642. Cent. i. No. 89.

11. Another on the same Subject; written Nov. 10th, 1642. Cent. i. No. 91.

12. Another, written Jan. 21st, 1643. Cent. i. No. 93.

13. Another, written April 6th, 1643. Cent. i. No. 95. In this friendly discussion, Gittichius represents fasting as a superstitious practice; and Ruarus, in his replies, defends the contrary view.

14. Fragment of a Letter on the Fasting of the Ninevites; written July 14th, 1643. Cent. i. No. 97.

15. Another Letter, written July 14th, 1643, or more probably, judging from the date, a part of the preceding, in which Gittichius accuses Grotius of dissimulation, and the intentional use of ambiguous phrasology, in the controversy about Satisfaction. Ad. Calc. Cent. i.

16. Explanation of the First Epistle of Peter, *MS.*; being part of a letter without date, addressed to Simon Pistorius.

17. Anti-Lessius: or, A Reply to Leonhard Less, the Jesuit, on the Choice of a Religion; probably the translation of a Polish work by Thomas Pisccius. (Vide Art. 165, No. 5.)

18. A Letter to Nicholas Harder, Rector of the Lutheran School at Wilna. The object of this Letter was to bring his correspondent over to his own opinion concerning the person of Christ. An outline of its contents is given by Bock, in his "Hist. Antitrin." T. I. P. i. pp. 383—385.

19. Two Examples of singular Divine Benignity: One, in receiving back into Favour those, who, through want of Consideration, fall back from the Christian Religion; the other, in guarding the unlearned from being seduced by Impostors, and precipitated into various Errors. This was an autograph manuscript, formerly in the possession of Bock, whose intention it was, some time or other, to publish it whole.

20. A Quarto Volume of Letters in the Latin and Polish Languages, some of which are published, while others remain unpublished. These Letters are for the most part addressed to persons, entertaining the same religious opinions as the writer, particularly Conrad Vorstius, and the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf,—Sohner, Paul Groe, John Murer, John Crellius, and others. The collection appears to have escaped the researches of Zeltner; but Bock, who had access to it, has extracted from it three Letters to Nicholas Harder; three to Jerome Moscorovius; two to some correspondent, whose name does not appear; and one to Valentine Smalcus. These he has published at the end of his account of Gittichius, who left behind him

21. Many other writings, which have probably perished long since; but to which allusions are occasionally made in the Synodical Acts. Among these are mentioned, A little Work against the Doctrine of the Trinity; A Discourse concerning God; On certain Words of Christ (supposed by Bock to be Matthew xxviii. 19); and On the Falsehoods and Calumnies heaped by evil-disposed Persons upon the Unitarian Church.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 108, 109. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 372—400; T. II. pp. 81—84. *Lamy*, Hist. du Socinianisme, P. ii. Chap. xxv. *Lubienieccii* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xiii. p. 258. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socinismi Altorf. pp. 78—93. 154. 157. 173. 190. 226—229. 432. 468. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 61—64. 89—97, et pp. 465—473, etc.

169.

MATTHIAS TWARDOCHLEB is a name, which was known to few ecclesiastical writers before the time of Bock; and yet a kind of romantic interest attaches to his life. There was a secret history among the Socinians, that he brought up Gregory Ottreprowicki, or Griska Uttrepreja, the well-known Pseudo-Demetrius; and that he was his private friend and adviser. This young man, under the name of Prince Demetrius, invaded Muscovy in the reign of Boris Godoonoff; seized the reins of government; and caused himself to be proclaimed Czar. Boris had acted in the capacity of Regent during the reign of Feodor Ivanovich, and is said to have procured the assassination of Demetrius, second son of Ivan Vassilovich, and brother of Feodor; and then to have slain the murderers. After this he poisoned Feodor, and usurped the vacant throne. But as usurpation commonly leads to tyranny, the reign of Boris was one of cruelty and oppression; and he became odious in the eyes of the people, who longed for an opportunity of shaking off the yoke. In the year 1604, a rumour went abroad, that Prince Demetrius, the last of the house of Rurik, who was supposed to have been murdered when a child at Uglitsch, was still living, and employed in making preparations for the assertion of his rights, and the recovery of the throne of his ancestors, who had ruled Muscovy, through a line of fifty-six sovereigns, and during a period of 736 years. Ottreprowicki, it is said, who had been educated in Poland, availing himself of the general dissatisfaction, and of his personal resemblance to the real Demetrius, assumed his name, gave out that another had been slain in his stead by the hired assassins of Boris, collected a band of followers, entered Russia, and being joined by the troops which had been sent to oppose him, was in full march on Moscow, when Boris suddenly died, April

13th, 1605, not without a strong suspicion of having lost his life by poison. Nothing now stood in the way of Ottreprowicki, who seized the reins of government, and was proclaimed Czar of Muscovy. But his reign was of short duration. He lost his life in a popular insurrection, headed by a boyar, of the name of Basil Zuski, by whose hand he perished, May 17th, or, according to some accounts, May 8th, 1606, at Moscow, while celebrating his nuptials with Anna Maria Georgia, daughter of the Palatine of Sandomir, to whom he had been married by proxy at Cracow, Nov. 24th, 1605.

The history of this enterprising youth is involved in considerable obscurity. Many of his contemporaries believed his claims to be well founded; and it is still considered doubtful, whether or not he was the person, whom he represented himself to be. Smalcus, in his Diary, evidently regards him as the real Prince Demetrius, and no impostor. Under the year 1604, he says, "This year Demetrius, son of John Basilius, Duke of Muscovy, became known, who had lain concealed for seven years in the monasteries of Ruvergne." (Zeltneri Hist. Crypto-Soc. Suppl. p. 1179.)

After Ottreprowicki had been seated on the throne a few months, Twardochleb undertook a journey to Moscow, for the purpose of visiting him, and was graciously and honourably received. According to Smalcus, he set out for Moscow on the 7th of November, 1605, accompanied by J. J. Morsecovius, Nicholas Rosteck, and Lubczowski. But his stay at Moscow was short. He saw a cloud gathering round the newly elevated monarch; availed himself of the approaching Synod in Poland, as an excuse for his abrupt departure; and thus saved himself from the jaws of destruction. It was very soon after he had left Moscow, that Ottreprowicki was slain by Basil Zuski, who succeeded

him as Czar, and whose adherents, from the time of Ottreprowicki's elevation to the throne, under the name of Demetrius, were actuated by a spirit of deadly enmity towards the Polish nation.

Gittichius mentions Twardochleb in an unpublished letter to Krokier, dated Jan. 27th, 1613; and in a manuscript letter to an anonymous friend, he says, "I am sorry that you, and our dearly beloved brother Twardochleb have not changed your surnames" Might not this regret be occasioned by a sense of the danger, to which Twardochleb exposed himself as the patron and friend of Ottreprowicki?

The subject of the present article first officiated as a Minister of the Socinian Church at Lublin. But he appears to have been uneasy in his situation there; and in 1615, was removed to the Church at Kissielin, of which he had the charge upwards of thirty years. He was a man of delicate constitution; and was allowed to make this change at his own request. His mind was impressed with the idea, that his life might be prolonged under every disadvantage at Kissielin, where there was a great paucity of medical practitioners, while at Lublin, where unprincipled Physicians abounded, and drugs were plentiful, and close at hand, it might be cut short at any moment by poison.

Twardochleb is represented as being by no means in straitened circumstances, but rather wealthy than otherwise; and annually, at each returning Synod, he made a present of a hundred florins to the funds of the Church. Lubieniec, who reckons him among the number of not unprofitable labourers in the Church of Lublin, says, that he was a man of singular piety, sparing in his diet and clothing, but munificent in his charities to the poor.

He wrote an account of his journey to Moscow, which, if it could now be recovered, would be a valuable historical document, in connexion with one of the most obscure por-

tions of Russian history. Bock says, he has no doubt that it once existed; and thinks that, in his time, it lay concealed somewhere. But his efforts to trace it to its possessor proved fruitless. At the Synod of Racow, in 1630, a resolution was passed, enjoining Twardochleb to commit to writing an account of his Muscovite journey to the Czar Demetrius, and to present it to the Synod, that it might be deposited in the public library of the Church, as a perpetual memorial of himself.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 977—980 *Lubienieci* Hist. Ref. Polon. L. iii. C. xiii. p. 255. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. l. c. *Smaleci* Diarium, A. D. 1604. 1605. *Greg. Sharpe's* Introd. to Universal History. Lond. 1758, 8vo. Ed. 2, p. 321, etc.

170.

GEORGE LUDWIG LEUCHSNER, (or LEUXNER,) was a convert of Ernest Sohner's at Altorf. He is incidentally mentioned by Sandius, who calls him Leuschner by mistake. Zeltner gives a full account of him, in his "Historia Crypto-Socinismi;" and describes him as an artful propagator of the Socinian heresy. He was a native of Biberach, a small town of Franconia, which is commonly known by the name of Marck Bibrach. He entered the University of Altorf, with his brother, John Leuchsner, on the 1st of December, 1595, and there continued the study of Jurisprudence till the year 1600, when he left. The name, by which he was known among the Altorfians, was *Luceius* or *Xenuleius*. He was related to Sohner; and this relationship led to the formation of an intimate acquaintance. By Sohner he was early imbued with Socinian notions.

Smalcus, under the date, July 5th, 1602, says, "Ludwig Leuchsner, a noble Frank, came to Lublin, and I went with him and Paul Krokier from Lublin to Solinus." (Apud Zeltner. pp. 1174, 1175.) It would be interesting

to learn with certainty who this Solinus was. The only Socinian, who is known to have been called *Solinus* was John Crellius, who could not, at this time, have been more than twelve years of age. Zeltner, therefore, suspects that Sohner, whose name in Latin was sometimes written *Sonnerus*, as if from *Sonne*, (the Sun,) may be the person intended. But is it not more probable, that *Solinus* is a mistake for *Socinus*? Leuchsner is mentioned as one of those, who were present, with Faustus Socinus and others, at a Synod held at Racow, in the year 1602, which lasted from the 7th to the 19th of October. The name of Paul Krokier also is mentioned next to that of Leuchsner; and Smalcus was one of the Ministers present. This combination of circumstances, taken in connexion with the fact, that it was customary, among the Polish Socinians, at that time, to introduce promising young men to Socinus, as the most influential person in their body, gives great weight to the above conjecture, and renders it in the highest degree probable, that it was to *Socinus*, and not to *Solinus*, that Smalcus went, accompanied by Ludwig Leuchsner and Paul Krokier.

While at Racow, Leuchsner was recognized as a Brother, and received the right hand of fellowship; and after visiting different parts of the world, he returned from Italy to Nuremberg, in the year 1604. He formed an intimacy with Gittichius, and other Socinians; and was very zealous in procuring the administration of the Lord's Supper among the Socinian Brethren at Altorf, when he returned.

After some years spent at Altorf, he settled at Nuremberg; and his name appears among the advocates of that republic, from 1607 to 1616, a year which was fatal to the Crypto-Socinians of Franconia. He was then given into custody, on a charge of heresy; and denied most strenuously having had any connexion with the Socinian party,

in the face of the plainest evidence to the contrary. But being hardly pressed, he admitted, that he had once thought the doctrine of the Trinity, which exceeded all others in sublimity, too high for investigation: but he denied, again and again, that he had ever given in his adhesion to the doctrines of Socinus. After this we hear no more of him. Zeltner conjectures that he left Nuremberg, or was banished from it, or came to a premature death through anxiety.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 175. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 430, 431. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 129—144. 147. 250—252. 496. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1602.

171.

GEORGE MANLIUS was one of those, who attended the Conferences, or Theological Exercises, held at the house of Smalcus, from the year 1606 to 1609. In the “Letter of an anonymous Writer, giving an Account of the Life and Death of Andrew Wissowatius,” which was printed among the supplementary matter to Sandius’s “*Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*,” he is mentioned (p. 229) as the successor of Brockayus, in the Rectorship of the School, or College of Racow; and appears to have been the second person who held that office.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 465. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vit. And. Wissowatii, p. 229.

172.

SEVERINUS MARTINUS, a Dane, attended the Conference at Racow in the month of October, 1602. In that year he was appointed to the office of colleague, or assistant to Ostorod at Dantzic; and James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia, allowed him a hundred Polish florins, equivalent to about twenty-five pounds of our money, as a salary. How long he remained at Dantzic is uncertain; but he seems, a few years afterwards, to have been Co-rector with

George Manlius of the College at Racow, and was one of those, who took part in the Theological Exercises, held in the house of Smalcus, who calls him "pientissimus frater," and says that he died on the 7th of December, 1609.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 465. Hist. Socin. Pruss. § vii. p. 14. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1609, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1186.

173.

ERNEST CALB, (or KALBIUS,) was a Livonian, of the city of Riga; and was known among the Poles by the name of CIOLEK, which is a translation of the German "Calb." We learn from the Synodical Acts, that he joined the Socinian Church in the year 1608, at the same time expressing a wish to be more fully instructed in its doctrines. He requested, however, that he might be employed as a Teacher in the College at Racow, in order that he might not be a burden to the Church. On this occasion, he was commended for his solid learning, and received fifty florins towards his support. He afterwards succeeded Valentine Smalcus, as Minister of the Church at Smigiel, when the latter removed from Smigiel to Racow. In 1611, he was ordained, with Michael Gittichius; and in 1616, was sent to the Church at Lasznyn, on the estate of Cyriac Lazinius, where he died of a scorbutic complaint, May 12th, 1618. Ruarus mentions him as a fit instrument for the conversion of others.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 87, 88. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1618, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1211. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 17.

174.

ANDREW WISSOWATIUS, (*Polon.* WYSZOWATY,) the Elder, was the son of Abraham Wissowatius, Chamberlain of Branska, who, in the "Anonymous Life of And. Wissowatius," Junior, annexed to the "Bibl. Antitrin." of Sandius, (p. 222,) is called Toparch of Szumski.

There were many persons, of some note among the Polish Socinians, who bore the name of *Wissowatius*; but as we shall not devote a separate article to every one of this name, who is mentioned in the Synodical Acts, we may here particularize THEODORE WISSOWATIUS, who was appointed Minister of the Church of Raciborsk in 1652, and who, in 1662, at the last Assembly of the Socinians held in Poland, was stationed at Manheim. CHRISTOPHER WISSOWATIUS also is mentioned in the Acts, about the year 1636; and is supposed to have been the same, who, at the Assembly of Czarcow, in 1651, introduced his two sons to the Church, as likely to be employed, at some future time, in its service. The elder of these sons was called ALEXANDER. The number of Wissowatii, who studied in the University of Königsberg, was considerable; but the greater part of these, though apparently related to the Polish family of that name, seem to have been orthodox in their opinions on the subject of the Trinity.

Andrew Wissowatius, Senior, had two brothers, BENEDICT and LAZARUS. He sustained the office of a Preacher in many places among the Unitarians in Poland; and was first appointed to that office in Volhynia and the Ukraine. About the year 1608, he was still presiding over the Church at Philipovia; and, by the persuasion of the Synod in that year, was induced to retain that charge some time longer. Whether he was the same, who, on the 15th of March, 1603, entered his name as a Student in the University of Königsberg, Bock does not undertake to decide.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 1009, 1010. *Anonymi* Epist. de Vit. And. Wissowatii, p. 222.

175.

BENEDICT WISSOWATIUS, (*Polon.* WISZOWATY,) the Elder, brother of the preceding, and uncle of Andrew Wissowa-

tius, Junior, was one of the founders of the Athenæum, or College at Racow; and was appointed, in conjunction with fourteen others, one of its first Moderators.

VIDEND. Art. 148. 174. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 1029. *Anonymi* Ep. de Vit. A. Wissowatii, p. 222.

176.

CHRISTOPHER PAWLOVIUS, (*Polon.* PAWLOWSKI,) studied some time at Altorf, about the year 1609; and afterwards went to some other German University. He subsequently abandoned the Unitarian cause, for the sake of promoting his worldly interests, and joined the Catholics. Bock alludes to certain manuscript letters of Gittichius, which throw light upon the history of this apostate; but he has made no further use of them, than to give the above brief outline of the character of Pawlovius.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 628.

177.

SAMUEL NIECIECIUS, (*Polon.* NISZCZYCKI,) was an inmate in the family of Valentine Radecius at Clausenburg, in the year 1603. In 1610, he was stationed, as a colleague with Andrew Lubieniecius, at the Church of Hoyszczee, in Volhynia; and in the same year received ordination. But he had not been long settled at Hoyszczee, before he was called to succeed George Manlius, as Rector of the College at Racow;—an office which he appears to have filled till the time of his death. Smalcus, in his Diary, calls him “*spes ministrorum gregis magna*,” and says, that he died on the 14th of January, 1613, of an epidemic fever, and that his wife survived him only about a week.

The only writing, which Nieciecius left behind him, was an unfinished answer to Pareus, in which he undertook to reply to those parts of that author’s “*Commentary on the*

Epistle to the Romans," which contain reflections on the opinions of the Unitarians. He commenced this answer, in compliance with a resolution passed at the Synod of Racow in 1611; and in 1615, Smalcus was requested to finish it.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 547. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1613, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1199. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 492.

178.

PAUL KROKIER, (CROQUIER, CROKIER, or KROKER,) Junior, was Rector of the College at Racow, from the year 1613 to 1616; and succeeded Samuel Nieciecius in that office. In the last year of his Rectorship, he obtained leave of absence, and was expected to resume his duties at the expiration of the time allowed him: but when he came back from France, he excused himself, and turned his attention, as it is thought, to the study of Medicine. *Bock* thinks that he was the Paul Krokier, who, about the year 1643, undertook the office of tutor to Peter Rzecycki, a noble youth of a celebrated Polish family. He wrote "Ethical Commentaries," to which *Ruarus* refers, in a letter to Peter Rzecycki.

Paul Krokier had a brother of the name of JOHN, who was possessed of great natural talents, and was urged by the Synod of Racow, in 1611, to employ them in the service of his Maker.

There was a person of the name of Kroker living at Lublin, as early as the year 1580, who married the daughter of John Balcerovicius; and to whom Faustus Socinus alludes in friendly terms, in a letter to Martin Czechovicius. But it is scarcely probable, that he was the subject of the present article.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 204, 205. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 86. Bibl. Fratr. Polon. T. I. p. 424.

179.

BARTHOLOMEW VIGILIUS, (*Germ.* WACH-AUF,) was a Westphalian, whose German name appears to have been Latinized, not, as Bock insinuates, for the purpose of concealment; but to give it a more classical air, in accordance with a well-known custom, which had prevailed among literary men, from the time of the Reformation. In the year 1603, he was appointed Co-rector of the College at Racow, with Christopher Brockayus, after a public disputation, “*De tribus Legibus Logicis*,” in which he gave ample proof of his qualifications for the office to which he aspired. He was present at the Conferences, or Theological Exercises, at the house of Smalcus, between the years 1606 and 1609. In the Synodical Acts, he is frequently called “*Gedanensis*,” to intimate that he was in some way connected with the city of Dantzic. In that city, for many years, he greatly benefited the Socinian Church, by his advice and assistance. His services were properly estimated at the time, and duly registered in the Synodical Acts. One of the most important of them was, the advice which he gave, respecting the establishment of a German printing-office at Dantzic, for the use of the Socinian Church. This proposal he brought forward at the Synod of the year 1617. But at the Assembly of Czarcow, in 1652, when his period of active service was almost over, while he thanked the Presidents of the Socinian Church for the favours which they still conferred upon him, he lamented his misfortune, in being removed from an advantageous situation to one which was less so. He was living as late as the year 1655, at which time Ruarus importuned the Church not to desert him.

There is no doubt, that Vigilius had been employed in translating the works of Socinian writers from the Polish into the German and Latin languages. That this was the

case, we learn from the Synodical Acts of the year 1615: but the titles of the books so translated are not given. In the year 1634 also, he sent from Dantzic to Racow some books, which he had rendered into Latin: but on this occasion, as in 1615, no mention is made of the titles of these books.

VIDEND. *Bock*, *Hist. Ant. T. I.* pp. 982, 983. *Sandii B. A.* p. 175.

180.

JOHN TYSCOVICIUS, or TYSKIEVICIUS, (*Polon.* TYSZKIEWICZ,) was a burgher of the town of Bielsk, in Podlachia. His relations, among whom was the Chief Magistrate of the town, longing to possess themselves of his property, which had recently received a considerable accession, by the death of a person to whom he was heir, sought to entrap him, by obliging him to accept the office of Chamberlain, or town treasurer, at the same time dispensing with the customary oath. But at the year's end, he was required to swear, that he had honestly discharged the duties of his office. At first he refused to do this; but when they urged him, and began to throw out suspicions of his having embezzled the public money, he consented to swear by Almighty God! This, however, was not permitted; and he was required to swear, either upon the wooden image of a crucifix, or by the Triune God. On positively refusing to do either the one or the other, he was falsely charged with trampling upon the crucifix, and with blaspheming the Trinity, and saying that he would not swear by it, for that he did not know whether it was male or female. Other charges of a similar nature were falsely brought against him, upon which he was reviled and beaten by the Magistrate of the town; and being condemned, and thrown into prison, he confidently appealed, in the King's absence, to the Supreme Tribunal of the kingdom, in proof of his

innocence. On his cause being heard, the Tribunal, honourably discharging its duty, pronounced him innocent, and acquitted him of all the accusations brought against him; in addition to which, the Magistrate of Bielsk was fined and punished, as a perverter of justice. Meanwhile, however, the enemies of Tyscovicus, persisting in their malicious charges, carried the cause to Queen Constantia, wife of Sigismund III., to whom the town of Bielsk had been granted, as an Archduchess of Austria. The Queen confirmed the Magistrate's sentence, and ordered that it should be carried into execution; and it was afterwards determined by the King in council, that Tyscovicus should suffer death. He was accordingly apprehended at Warsaw, whither he had gone to clear himself; committed to close confinement; and a short time after, the dreadful sentence of death was pronounced upon him, in these terms:—That, whereas he had been guilty of blasphemy, his tongue should be plucked out; that, whereas he had dared to appeal to the Tribunal of the kingdom, and had been guilty of contumacy towards the Magistrate to whom he was subject, and towards Her Majesty the Queen's decree, by which he had been remanded to the same Magistrate, he should be beheaded as an obstinate offender, and a rebel; that, whereas he had thrown down the image of the crucifix, and trampled upon it, his hand and his foot should be cut off: and finally, that he should be burnt as a heretic. The Jesuits and Monks, who had before pressed him to change his religion, urged him more vehemently than ever, when the royal decree was read; and promised, that the sentence of death should be revoked, and that his property should be restored to him, if he would comply. But he turned a deaf ear to their entreaties; and resisted their importunities the more strongly, the shorter his term of existence became. When they found that they could not

prevail upon him, either by threats or promises, he was led to the stake, in the market-place at Warsaw, where preparations had been made for his execution; and was put to death, according to his sentence. This tragedy was perpetrated on the 16th of November, at the hour of nine in the morning, A. D. 1611.

"The Catholics," says Dr. T. Rees, "were greatly elated by their success in this cruel persecution, and certainly not without reason, as they had been warmly opposed in the whole of the proceedings by many of the first individuals among the Nobility of the country. Their triumph gave a new impulse to their intolerance, and led them to seize every opportunity to prejudice the Unitarians in the public mind, and arm against them the powers of the government."

VIDEND. *Brevis Relatio de Johannis Tyseovicii Martyrio*; ad calc. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 203—206. *Smalcii Diarium*, A. D. 1611. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. viii. p. 187. *Rees's* Hist. Introd. pp. xxxii—xxxiv.

181.

BARTHOLOMEW LEGATE, whom Lamy, mistaking the proper name *Legate* for an appellative, calls "un Berthelmi qui avoit rempli des Ambassades," was a native of the county of Essex; and is thus described by Fuller, in his "Church History of Britain." "Person comely, complexion black, age about forty years: Of a bold spirit, confident carriage, fluent tongue, excellently skilled in the Scriptures; and well had it been for him, if he had known them lesse, or understood them better; whose ignorance abused the Word of God, therewith to oppose *God the Word*. His conversation (for ought I can learn to the contrary) very unblameable; And the poyson of Hereticall Doctrine is never more dangerous, than when served up in clean cups, and washed dishes."

He was thrown into prison on a charge of heresy; and

King James had many personal interviews with him, and employed all the stores of his learning, for the purpose of converting him to the orthodox faith. On one occasion the King expected, that he should surprise him into a confession of Christ's Deity, by asking him, whether he did not daily pray to Jesus Christ? Had Legate answered this question in the affirmative, the King fancied, that he should have been able to convict him of error out of his own mouth: for, in his opinion, such an answer would have been tantamount to an admission, that Christ was a searcher of the heart, and therefore God. But Legate replied, much to His Majesty's surprise, that he had, indeed, prayed to Christ in the days of his ignorance, but had not done so for the last seven years. This reply so ruffled the King's temper, that he spurned Legate from him with his foot, and said, "Away! base fellow! It shall never be said, that one stayeth in my presence, who hath never prayed to the Saviour for seven years together."

Legate was frequently summoned before the Bishops in the Consistory of St. Paul's; but they had no better success than James himself, in their efforts to wring from him a confession of his supposed errors. He denied their authority to call in question his opinions; and protested loudly and vehemently against their proceedings. The disputation against him was conducted principally by Dr. John King, Bishop of London; but the arguments of this learned Prelate, although they had some effect upon the minds of the by-standers, elicited from the accused himself nothing in the shape of a concession.

Fuller, to whom we are mainly indebted for the above particulars, respecting the person of Legate, and the attempts made to convince him of his alleged errors, has given a full, and apparently an accurate account of his opinions, which he introduces in the following cautious and solemn

manner. "Before we set down his pestilent Opinions, may Writer and Reader fence themselves with prayer to God, against the infection thereof; lest otherwise, *touching such pitch* (though but with the bare mention) *defile us*, casually tempting a temptation in us, and awaking some corruption, which otherwise would sleep silently in our souls. And, if notwithstanding this our caution, any shall reap an accidental evil to themselves, by reading his damnable opinions, my pen is no more accessary to their harm, than that Apothecarie is guilty of murder, if others, out of a licourish curiosity, kill themselves with that poyson, which he kept in his shop for soveraigne use to make Antidotes thereof." Fuller then proceeds to say, "His damnable Tenets were as followeth: 1. That the Creed called the *Nicene Creed*, and *Athanasius Creed*, contain not a profession of the true Christian faith. 2. That Christ is not God of God, begotten, not made; but begotten, and made. 3. That there are no Persons in the Godhead. 4. That Christ was not God from everlasting, but began to be God, when he took flesh of the Virgin *Mary*. 5. That the world was not made by Christ. 6. That the Apostles teach Christ to be Man onely. 7. That there is no generation in God, but of creatures. 8. That this assertion, *God to be made man*, is contrary to the rule of Faith, and monstrous blasphemy. 9. That Christ was not before the fulness of time, except by promise. 10. That Christ was not God, otherwise than an anointed God. 11. That Christ was not in the form of God equal with God, that is, in substance of God, but in righteousness, and giving salvation. 12. That Christ by his Godhead wrought no miracle. 13. That Christ is not to be prayed unto." We have in the "Diary of Walter Yonge, Esq.," a statement of the opinions of Legate, which agrees in every essential particular with the account given by Fuller.

When he had been in Newgate for some time, he was set at liberty, according to Gerard Croese. But on his liberation, he defended his opinions with more boldness than ever; and threatened to bring an action, for false imprisonment, against the court which committed him. This indiscretion involved him in fresh difficulties; and he was once more summoned to appear before Bishop King, in the Consistory of St. Paul's. The Bishop, foreseeing that the proceedings would be narrowly watched, and possibly misrepresented, took care to fortify himself by the opinions of several able Divines, and learned Jurists, as well as by those of his brother Bishops. The penal laws against Heretics were at that time in full force. They had undergone no relaxation; but had only been allowed to slumber for a while; and it was in the power of the public authorities to revive them at their pleasure, and, by their aid, cause any person convicted of heresy to be burnt at the stake. By these laws Legate was tried, and convicted of contumacious, and irreclaimable heresy, before the Bishop of London (Dr. Edwards); the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Saunderson); the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (Dr. Morton, Dean of Westminster); the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Leyfield); the Dean of St. Paul's (Sir John Blount); and Sir Thomas Fowler. The conviction took place on the 21st of February, 1611. He was then delivered over to the secular judges, by an instrument, called a *Significavit*, and bearing date March 3rd, 1611. This, according to our present mode of reckoning, would be March 3rd, 1612; for January, February, and the greater part of March, were at that time regarded as belonging to the preceding year, and the new year was considered as commencing at the time of the vernal equinox. Hence we frequently find dates, which fall within the first three months of the year, written both ways, thus:—March 3rd, 161 $\frac{1}{2}$, that is, 1611, according to

one mode of reckoning, and 1612, according to another. The King, by his letters, dated March 11th, under the privy seal, having given orders to the broad seal, to direct the Writ *De Hæretico comburendo*, the writ was issued on the 14th of March, and Legate was conducted, by the Sheriffs of London, to West Smithfield, on the 18th of March; and about mid-day, in the presence of a large concourse of people, burnt to death.

“Never,” says Fuller, “did a scare-fire at midnight summon more hands to quench it, than this at noonday did eyes to behold it. At last, refusing all mercy, he was burned to ashes. And so we leave him, the first that for a long time suffered death in that manner: And, oh that he might be the last to deserve it!” No unprejudiced person in the present day, of whatever denomination he may be, can read such remarks without an involuntary shudder, combined with a feeling of shame, that professing Christians should ever have thought it their duty to burn alive their fellow-men, for differing from them in opinion, however gross, or (to use the current phrases) *blasphemous and damnable* their presumed errors may have been.

VIDEND. *Lamy*, Histoire du Socinianisme, p. 130. *Fuller's Church History of Britain*, Bk. x. Sect. iv. pp. 62—64. *Diary of Walter Yonge*, Esq., Justice of the Peace and M. P. for Honiton, written at Colyton, and Axminster, from 1604 to 1628. Edited by George Roberts. London, printed for the Camden Society, 1848, 4to. pp. 25, 26. *Gerard Croese's General Hist. of the Quakers*, Bk. iii. pp. 192, 193. *Locke's Familiar Letters*, pp. 448, 449. *Christian Reformer*, N. S., Vol. XI. (1844) pp. 100. 343. Ref. *Art.* 183.

182.

EDWARD WIGHTMAN was connected with the hamlet of Wykin, and appears, from Burton's “History of Leicestershire,” to have resided there, before his apprehension on a charge of heresy at Burton-upon-Trent. Gerard Croese describes him as belonging to the “town” of Burton; but

in the King's letter, under the privy seal, as well as in the warrant for his execution, he is called "Edward Wightman, of the *parish* of Burton-upon-Trent, in the diocess of Coventry and Lichfield."

In the year 1651, a work was published in London, entitled, "The Narrative History of King James, for the first Fourteen Years, in Four Parts." The fourth Part purports to contain "A True Relation of the Commissions and Warrants for the Condemnation and Burning of Bartholomew Legatt and *Thomas Withman*," — an evident mistake for *Edward Wightman*. Gerard Croese errs, also, in calling him "*R. Wightman*;" for in all the documents connected with his trial and execution, as well as in Fuller's "Church History," he is uniformly designated "*Edward Wightman*."

"The Narrative History" above alluded to is without any author's name; but the documents adduced sufficiently attest the accuracy of the facts recorded. Locke, writing to his correspondent, Limborch, tells him, that, after briefly alluding to the circumstances attending the trial and condemnation of Bartholomew Legate, and his being delivered over to the secular arm, and finally committed to the flames, and burnt in West Smithfield, the anonymous author goes on to say, that Edward Wightman underwent the same punishment in the city of Lichfield, in the year 1611, after being condemned by the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, for holding certain heretical opinions. In the same letter, Locke gives his correspondent a list of the opinions, for holding which Wightman suffered; and Fuller, in his Church History, after stating, that "Edward Wightman, of Burton-upon-Trent, convicted before Richard Neile, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, was burned at Lichfield for far worse opinions (if worse might be) than Legate maintained," proceeds, in his usual quaint style, as follows.

“Mary Magdalene indeed was possessed with *seven* devils, but *ten* several heresies were laid to Wightman’s charge; namely, those of Ebion, Cerinthus, Valentinian, Arrius, Macedonius, Simon Magus, Manes, Manichæus, Photinus, and of the Anabaptists.” From this enumeration, which is taken from the warrant for his execution, it is evident, that Wightman was charged with holding opinions, some of which were irreconcilably opposed to each other. “This list,” says the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, “of no less than ten heresies, for which this person was condemned to so shocking a death, is very formidable, and deserves to be examined. Ebion, or the Ebionites, Arius and Photinus, severally held opinions concerning Christ, incompatible with each other; therefore Wightman could but be charged with one of the three. Manes and Manichæus, are names of one and the same person or sect. Of Simon Magus, Origen tells us expressly, (*Contr. Cels. L. vi. p. 272.*) that he was a total unbeliever, setting himself up, and being set up by his followers, as a rival to Christ. Here then are four of these heresies struck off the list.” Mr. Lindsey might have added, that Ecclesiastical History affords no traces of the existence of any such heretic as “Valentinian,” although there were three Roman Emperors of that name; and that the heresiarch intended was *Valentinus*, the founder of a sect, called, after his own name, *Valentinians*. This multiplication of heresies, therefore, was a mere artifice, for the purpose of covering the cruelty of the act, by a show of justice; but it exhibits, at the same time, marks of the grossest, and most unpardonable ignorance.

What Limborch says, in reply to Locke, will be found to be much to the purpose, in this connexion. “I thank you for the labour which you have undertaken at my request. I am glad to have learnt from your letter, what,

in the judgment of the Bishops of that period, were the horrid crimes, which could be expiated only by the cruel punishment of burning alive. I see that sometimes one and the same doctrine is expressed in different words; and in such a manner, that what might have been comprehended in one article, is spun out into many, doubtless that the being charged with a number of heresies might serve as a pretext for so cruel a punishment. I should prefer reading the men's doctrines expressed in their own words; I should thus be certain, that I was not reading the inferences of others, but their own doctrines, and that too, not clothed in obnoxious terms, and perhaps distorted, so as to give a different sense, but openly and candidly enunciated in the very words of the persons themselves, and containing nothing but that, which each of the accused acknowledged as his own."

Mr. Lindsey regretted, that he was not fortunate enough to meet with a copy of the anonymous work mentioned above. (*Hist. View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine*, Chap. iv. Sect. i. p. 274.) But the Rev. B. Mardon, to whom the literary world is already indebted for many occasional contributions to the history of Unitarians and Unitarianism, and from whom other important disclosures of a similar nature may be expected in due time, has made known so much of this work as relates to our present subject, in a valuable article on the "Burning of Edward Wightman," inserted in "*The Christian Reformer*" for the year 1844 (pp. 100—103). The Commission and Warrant for the execution of Wightman, which Mr. Mardon subjoined to that article, the reader will find transferred to the Appendix of the present work, No. ix.

Well might Gilbert Clerke, a learned Unitarian writer, who flourished towards the close of the seventeenth century, ask,—“Reader, if thou art a Christian, what dost

thou think that Christ will say in the day of judgment to those, who not only revile, but cruelly persecute his followers under the name of *Pneumatomachi*" (*those who fight against the Spirit*,—a name anciently given to the Macedonians, and sometimes applied, by the contemporaries of Gilbert Clerke, to those who denied the personality of the Holy Spirit): "nay, who burnt alive a certain martyr, (Whitman,) at Lichfield, because he denied the Supreme Godhead of the Holy Ghost, and his coëquality with the Father?"

In the King's Commission, addressed to the Lord Chancellor, Ellesmere, directing him to make out the writ for the execution of Wightman, the *Significavit* of the Bishop is said to have borne date, the fourteenth day of December, in the *ninth* year of James's reign; or Dec. 14th, 1611. Now Fuller states, that Wightman was executed the month after Legate; and Legate was burnt, as we have already seen, on the 18th of March, 1612. It would appear, therefore, that more than three months elapsed between the issuing of the *Significavit*, and the execution of the sentence: nor will there seem anything improbable in this, when it is considered, that Wightman, as the King states, after being delivered over to the secular power, was "often very charitably moved and exhorted, as well by the said Bishop, as by many other godly, grave and learned Divines, to dissuade, revoke and remove him from the said blasphemous, heretical, and Anabaptistical opinions." The sentence was probably carried into execution, April 11th, 1612.

VIDEND. *Gerard Croese's* Gen. Hist. of the Quakers, p. 193. *Christian Reformer*, N. S., Vol. XI. pp. 99—103. 227, 228. 343. *Locke's* Familiar Letters, pp. 449—457. *Fuller's* Church Hist. of Britain, l. c. The Narrative Hist. of King James, for the first Fourteen Years, in four Parts. Part iv. A True Relation of the Commissions and Warrants for the Condemnation and Burning of Bartholomew Legatt and

Edward Withman, the one in West Smithfield, the other in Litchfield, in the Year 1611, signed with King James's own Hand. London, 1651. *Lindsey's* Apology on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, 3rd Ed. Chap. ii. p. 53. Hist. View of the State, &c. of the Unitarian Doctrine, Chap. iv. Sect. i. pp. 290—294. Ante-Nicenisimus, sive Testimonia Patrum qui scripserunt ante Concilium Nicenum, quoad Articulum de Trinitate. Cosmopoli, Anno 1694, [Authore Gilberto Clerke, Anglo.] p. 30.

183.

ULRIC HERWART is not mentioned by Sandius, because he published nothing in his own name. Whether he was descended from the ancient and flourishing family of Heerwart, of Augsburg, is uncertain. Michael Gittichius calls him “pious Ulric, of Dantzic,” in a letter, addressed to him from Novogrodek, Dec. 12th, 1616, which Bock has inserted in his “*Historia Socinianismi Prussici*” (p. 20).

He was the assistant of Valentine Smalcus in the Church of Buskow, near Dantzic, and, in a certain sense, the successor both of Smalcus and Ostorod; yet under the character of a Theological Candidate, or a Catechist, to whom the question was put by the Synod of Racow in 1608,—On what conditions he had determined in his own mind to serve that Church? In the year following he was released from the burden of office for a time, by permission of the Synod of Lublin, on the ground of ill health; but with an understanding, that he should assist Ostorod, as far as lay in his power. On the death of the latter in 1612, Herwart was regularly admitted to the office of the ministry; and took upon himself the charge of the Church of Buskow, in conformity with the decision of the Synod of Racow, although the Church was dissatisfied with the appointment, and was reconciled to it only by the representations of Smalcus.

It appears, from the letter of Gittichius above mentioned, that funds had been supplied, by some wealthy

member of the Polish Socinian Church, for printing the unedited writings of Faustus Socinus; and that some one, bearing the Christian name of Daniel, probably Daniel Franconius, (*vide Art.* 164,) had written to Gittichius, in the name of Ulric Herwart, requesting that, if he had any of Socinus's unpublished manuscripts, he would transmit them to Herwart, with a view to their publication. Accordingly, Gittichius sends him a packet of the Letters of Socinus; the Disputation with Gabriel Eutropius; the Explanation of the first Chapter of John's Gospel, with the Confirmation of that Explanation; the Disputation with Christian Francken; the Animadversions on Niemojevius; the Remarks on the Lord's Supper, written, as it would seem, partly by Lælius, and partly by Faustus Socinus; and the Explanation of Romans vii.;—and he adds, "Pray let me receive these manuscripts in print as early as possible!" He excuses himself from sending the Explanations of various Passages of Scripture, because they lie scattered over different works, and his occupations will not allow him time to copy them out; but he promises to bring them with him, when he attends the Synod in Poland, where he likewise has Socinus's Commentary on Matthew v. These, with other manuscripts of Socinus, not mentioned in Gittichius's letter, it will be seen, on a reference to *Article* 90, were first printed at the press of Sebastian Sternacki, in 1618. In that year, as we learn from the Synodical Acts, the ministerial duties of Ulric Herwart at Buskow were suspended, and he was called to Racow, doubtless for the purpose of superintending the publication of these works; for, during his residence in that city, he was hospitably entertained, and in the enjoyment of a considerable salary.

184.

JOHN FRANCK was a native of Dresden, and went to Poland in 1612, at which time he joined the Socinian Church. He met with a cordial welcome; and an annual allowance was granted him out of the Church funds. In the year 1613, he received ordination, and was stationed at Meseritz; and from 1618, he had the charge of the Unitarians of Dantzic. He was one of the many correspondents of Gittichius.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 364, 365.

185.

WILDEBRAND FORKENBRECK is mentioned by Smalcus, in connexion with a young Westphalian, of the city of Munster, as silent and artful. He joined the Polish Socinians on the 23rd of December, 1612; and took his leave, in a very unceremonious manner, before the next St. Bartholomew's day. Nothing more appears to be known of him. But Hoornbeek mentions one JOHN FORKENBRECK, possibly the brother or uncle of Wildebrand, among those pupils of Vorstius, who republished at Franeker, in 1610, under the title, "*De Officio Hominis Christiani*," Faustus Socinus's treatise, designed to shew, that those, who are called Evangelicals, in the Kingdom of Poland, and Dukedom of Lithuania, and are lovers of real piety, ought to unite themselves to those Churches in the same country, the members of which are falsely called *Arians*, or *Ebionites*.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 359. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1612.

186.

THOMAS SEGETHUS was a native of Scotland, who spent much of his time in visiting foreign countries. No detailed

account of his wanderings has reached the present age; but the vicissitudes through which he passed in Bohemia, Hungary, Poland and Muscovy, according to Ruarus, were sufficient to have filled a volume. While in Poland he became a member of the Socinian Church; but what was his original inducement for visiting that country does not appear. Count Krasinski says, "Many Scotch families settled in Poland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, where they resided, some for commercial purposes, some as military adventurers, and some, perhaps, because they found a safe asylum during the religious commotions which disturbed their own as well as many other countries. They had large congregations at Cracow, Posnania, Kiedany, (a town in Lithuania,) and at Lissa or Leszno, the heritage of the illustrious family of Leszczynski. They became thoroughly Poles, and many Scotch names, such as Haliburton, Gordon, Middleton, Watson, &c., are found amongst the Polish gentry. Several others, as Forbes, Inglis, &c., are extinct, but are well known. There was a celebrated Polish author descended from these families, Dr. Johnston, who wrote several works on Natural Philosophy." (Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland, Vol. II. p. 181.) It is difficult to resolve the name *Segethus* into any North British name, with which we are now familiar. But the person who bore it may have dropped his national surname, and substituted this in its place, as other foreigners are known to have done, after their settlement in Poland.

Smalcius says, in his Diary, that Thomas Segethus had conceived a taste for divine truth at Lublin; and that he went to Racow, July 13th, 1612, for the purpose of learning something more respecting it. His stay at Racow, however, did not exceed six days. Ruarus, when a student at Altorf, writing to Heino Vogler, mentions a visit

which he received from “Thomas Segetus;” and speaks of him as an old friend. At this interview Segethus alluded to his intercourse with Smalcus and others at Racow; and the glowing account which he gave of the state of things in that seed-bed of Unitarianism no doubt had its effect in inducing Ruarus himself to visit Racow in 1614. (Vide Art. 195.) “Is aiebat, se, cùm Racoviâ, minoris Poloniæ oppido, ubi Socinianorum hæresis potissimum floret, datâ operâ transiisset, putasse, quòd in alium terrarum orbem delatus venerit: cùm enim alibi bellis omnia et tumultu perstreperent, ibi quietâ fuisse omnia, homines sedatos et ad modestiam compositos, ut angelos existimare possis, cæteroquin acres in disputando linguarumque peritissimos, inter quos præcipuè nominabat Smalcium, Thuringum quendam, et Hieronymum Moscorovium Andreæ Dudithii generum.”

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 828, 829. *Smalcii* Diar. A. D. 1612, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1196. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. ii. N. 1.

187.

JOHN GROTKOVIVS, (*Polon.* GROTKOWSKI,) is frequently mentioned in the Synodical Acts, in which, and in the Diary of Smalcus, he is indifferently called *Grokovius*, *Krotoivius* and *Krotkovius*. He was a Polish, or Lithuanian Noble, whom Smalcus induced, when a young man, to devote himself to theological study; and to whom he gave his eldest daughter, Christina, in marriage, when she was at the early age of fifteen. Grotkovius settled first at Luclavice, in the province of Cracow; removed to Zarsyn in 1612; and in 1620, at the Synod of Racow, relinquished the ministry, on the ground, that he felt himself unequal to the performance of its duties.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 413, 414. *Smalcii* Diar. A. D. 1610. 1612, apud *Zeltn.* pp. 1186. 1197.

188.

—HERNWIRTH translated the Hymns, used by the Socinians in their Churches, from the Polish into the German, as we learn from the Synodical Acts, A. D. 1615, at which time a plan for their publication was agitated.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 415.

189.

JOHN MOSCHOVIUS, (*Polon.* MOSZCHOWSKI,) or MOSCHOVINUS, is mentioned by George Zavodski, in his Diary, on the authority of Matthew Belus, as employed in disseminating Socinianism in Hungary, A. D. 1616.

VIDEND. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 522, 523.

190.

STEPHEN CURCELLÆUS, (*Gal.* COURCELLES,) was born at Geneva, May 2nd, 1586, and died at Amsterdam, May 22nd, 1658. He was first a Preacher among the French Protestants, and afterwards Professor of Theology in the Remonstrant College at Amsterdam, in which office he succeeded the celebrated Episcopius.* He composed many works on theological subjects, which were collected, and published in the year 1675, under the superintendence of Philip à Limborch. Sandius has been blamed for mentioning Curcellæus in conjunction with Antitrinitarian writers, and representing his sentiments as Unitarian; and Jonathan Edwards, in his "Preservative against Socinianism," (p. 11,) has endeavoured to shew, that he believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. But the tenor of his correspondence with Ruarus leads to the opposite conclusion; and John Gottl. Möller, in his Dissertation "De Stephano Curcellæo, in Editione originalis N. T. Textûs, etc. Soci-

* APPENDIX, No. x.

nizante," (C. i. § 19, p. 19,) maintains it to have been the opinion of Curcellæus, that all Christian sects, not excepting the Unitarians, agree in fundamentals; and that his edition of the New Testament is favourable to Socinianism. Bock also says, that too great an affection for Socinianism misled him; that he defended the frigid conceptions of the Socinians concerning God and Christ; and that, in the opinion of Weissmann, it was doubtful, whether any Schlichtingius, or Ruarus, had a much worse Theology than Curcellæus. When, in addition to these strong presumptions, it is remembered, that Curcellæus, in writing to Ruarus about John Stoinius, (vide *Art.* 204,) adopts the nomenclature of the Crypto-Socinians of Altorf, no rational doubt can remain, that he ought to be ranked among Antitrinitarians. Sandius gives the following Catalogue of his works.

1. *Advis d'un Personnage desinteressé, &c.* In this work, published in 1638, Curcellæus acts the part, as it were, of a mediator between Moses Amyraut and Peter du Moulin, in their dispute about Predestination.

2. *A Vindication of the Sentiments of Arminius on the Right of God over his innocent Creatures, against Moses Amyraut, Professor of Theology at Saumur.* Amst. 1645, Blaen.

3. *Preface to the first Volume of the Works of Simon Episcopius.* Amst. 1650, Fol.

4. *An Edition of the Greek Translation of Comenius's "Janua Linguarum."* Sandius and Moreri both speak of this translation as the work of Curcellæus: but this is a mistake. The Greek version was made by Theodore Simonis, under the superintendence, and at the expense of the Polish Unitarians; and published at Amsterdam in 1642. (Vide *Art.* 243, No. 4.) An improved edition of it was prepared by Curcellæus, and published at the same

place in 1644; and in this amended form it has often been since reprinted.

5. A Letter to Samuel Sorbieri on the Abuses or Errors of the Church of Rome. This Letter, which is in French, was written at Amsterdam, Dec. 24th, 1655, and published in 8vo., without any specification of time or place. Subjoined to it is a letter addressed by Sorbieri to Pope Alexander VII.

6. A Letter to Adrian Paet, Advocate, of Rotterdam, on the Superstitions of the Romish Church; written at Amsterdam in 1656, and published along with the preceding Letter in 8vo. This Letter, which is in French, was translated into Latin, and inserted in Curcellæus's Theological Works.

7. An Edition of the New Testament, in Greek, with Various Readings, collected both from Manuscripts and printed Editions. Amst. 1658, 12mo., and 1675, 12mo. Elzev.

8. A Defence of the Ecclesiastical History of David Blondel, Professor in the Athenæum at Amsterdam, against the Charges of Maresius. Amst. 1657, Blaeu. This Defence was prefixed, in lieu of a Preface, to Blondel's Dissertation, in which he shews, that the well-known story about Pope Joan ought to be rejected as a fiction.

9. A Diatribe on the eating of Blood among Christians. Amst, 1659. This was translated into Dutch, and published in 12mo.

10. A Quaternion of Theological Dissertations against Samuel Maresius, treating upon the following Subjects. i. On the Words *Trinity*, *Hypostatis*, *Person*, *Essence*, *Consubstantial*, and the like; with an Appendix on the Sense in which the Ancients said that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are One God, and taught that they are of the same Substance. This is followed by a letter of James Arminius

to J. Uitenbogaerdt, written Feb. 18th, 1599, in which he discusses the question, Whether Jesus Christ may properly be called *God of himself*. ii. On Original Sin. iii. On the Necessity of a Knowledge of Christ to Salvation. iv. On the Justification of Man by Faith and Works. Subjoined is the Judgment of a learned anonymous Writer, [Daniel Zwicker,] on Maresius's "Pope Joan restored." Amst. 1659, 8vo. This work, as the date shews, was posthumous.

11. A Letter to Martin Ruarus, written Oct. 9th, 1641, on the Racovian Books burnt at Leeuwarden.

12. Another Letter to Ruarus, dated Feb. 8th, 1642, in which the writer laments, that a similar burning of books has taken place at Amsterdam.

13. A third Letter to Ruarus on the reparation made for that act by the newly elected Magistrates. Amst. April 12th, 1642. These three Letters were printed in the first Century of Ruarus's Select Epistles. Amst. 1677, 8vo.

14. A Treatise on Predestination in French. A manuscript copy of this was preserved by Curcellæus's unmarried daughter, Mary.

15. An Introduction to Chronology. *MS.*

16. Brief Notes on F. Burgersdicius's Metaphysics, extending to Chap. xxiii. § 4.

17. Encomium on Astronomy and Geography. *MS.*

18. Theological Works of S. Curcellæus. Amst. 1675, Fol. Curâ Limborch. This volume contains, in addition to Curcellæus's "Inst. Relig. Christianæ" in seven books, A Treatise on the Church of Jesus Christ. Both were left in an unfinished state by their author. To these were added, A Diatribe on 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; Nos. 2, 3, 9, 10; An Ethical Synopsis; and Letters to Grotius, Peter Cupus, Phil. à Limborch, Christian Hartsœker, and Adrian

Paet, which had been previously published in “Letters Ecclesiastical and Theological of celebrated Men.” Amst. 1660.—Five Books of the “Inst. Rel. Christ.” were translated into Dutch by Q. V., and printed at Leyden in 1678, 4to. The rest of the Theological Works of Curcellæus in Dutch, with the exception of No. 10, were in the press in 1684, when Sandius published his “Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum.”

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 109—112. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. COURCELLES. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 217; T. II. pp. 141—143. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 85—88.

191.

THEODORE RAPHAELIS CAMPHUYSIUS, (*Belg.* DIRCK RAPHAELSEN KAMPENHUYSEN,) was born at Gorcum, a fortified town of South Holland, in the year 1586; and was educated for the ministry among the Remonstrants. He settled with a congregation at Fleuten; but afterwards relinquished the pastoral office, and became one of the leaders in the sect of Collegiants,* the numbers of which he very much contributed to increase. He was sometimes heard to say, indeed, that he could not approve of their opinions and proceedings on all points; yet he did everything in his power to promote their interests, declaring at the same time, that the sole end and aim of his actions was to put a stop to the growth of sects and parties, and to abolish the distinctions, which kept Christians asunder, and prevented them from holding communion with each other. “I do not mean,” said he, “to separate from the Remonstrants: indeed, I separate from no man, nor will I enlist myself absolutely under any man’s colours.” He further admitted, that the Remonstrants were the best, and came the nearest to his own views of all the sects in Holland. The other leaders among the Collegiants adopted the same language,

* APPENDIX, No. xi.

saying, that they would create no schism, and would join no particular denomination of Christians; and that those, who would not act upon the same principle, were the real schismatics. Camphuysius died at Woreum, in Friesland, in the year 1627. All his works were in Dutch. The following is a translation of their titles, as given by Sandius.

1. Theological Works (Amst. 1640, 4to.; 1657, 8vo.; 1672, 4to.) in three Parts. i. On Infallible Judgment. ii. Sermons. iii. Letters and Extracts.

2. A Poetical Paraphrase of the Psalms of David. This Paraphrase has gone through many editions. The most recent, in the time of Sandius, was printed at Amsterdam by Jan Rieuwertsz and Pieter Arentsz. 1679, 12mo.

3. Sacred Songs, of which the eighteenth edition was published in 1680, at Amsterdam, 12mo.

4. The same, set to Music by Joseph Buthler. Amst. 1652, Fol.

5. Some of the above Sacred Songs translated into German by Robert Robertyn.

6. The "Idolelenchus" of Geisteranus rendered into Dutch Verse.

7. On the State of Souls. 1631, 4to.; 1666, 4to.

8. On the State of the Dead, and the Punishments of the Wicked after the present Life; to which is prefixed "A Compendium of the Doctrine of the Socinians," 4to.

9. An Extract from a Letter of Theod. Raph. Camphuysius, proving that the Opinion concerning the Annihilation of the Wicked is not unedifying. 1666, 4to.

10. Judgment concerning the Writings of Faustus Socinus, in a Distich, prefixed to "The Life of F. Socinus," translated into Dutch. 8vo.

11. A Farewell to the World; or an Invitation to the Brotherhood of Christ. The second edition of this was published in 1650, 4to.

12. Faustus Socinus's Treatise "De Auctoritate S. Scripturæ," translated into Dutch, and illustrated with Notes. Prefixed to this is James Sieninius's Dedication to Sigismund III., King of Poland, written at Racow, Nov. 20th, 1608; which is likewise generally prefixed to V. Smalcus's Polish Treatise "On the Divinity of Jesus Christ." 1623, 4to.; 1666, 4to.

13. Faustus Socinus's "Lectiones Sacræ," translated into Dutch, and illustrated with Notes. 1666, 4to.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 112, 113. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 92; T. II. pp. 746—748. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. IV. Bk. xlviii. pp. 56, 57.

192.

JOHN EVERTSON GEISTERANUS, (*Belg.* JAN EVERTSZ GEESTERAN,) was the son of Everhard Geisteranus, whom Zeltner supposes to have been the person called *Spiritus*, by A. F. Modrevius, in the first book of his *Sylvæ*. He was born at Alkmaar, in Holland, Nov. 8th, 1586, N. S., and appointed Pastor of the Church in that place; but was deprived in the year 1619, for holding communion with the Remonstrants. He differed from them, however, on some points, believing that it is not lawful for a Christian to exercise the office of a Civil Magistrate, or to bear arms. In the years 1614 and 1615, he disputed with Conrad Vorstius on these subjects, in the presence of the Ministers, Edward Poppius, Charles Rykwart, Samuel Næranus, and John Speenhovius; maintaining, in opposition to all of them, that it is not lawful for Christians to exercise dominion, or to inflict violence upon the persons and lives of other men. The only deviation from this rule, which he would allow, was that of paternal correction. Much was said on both sides; but the disputants ended as they began, each retaining his own opinion. Vorstius

particularly insisted upon the danger of taking up such views hastily, or on insufficient grounds; and pointed out the inconveniences likely to result from them, if generally adopted, and acted upon by the common people. He so far prevailed upon Geisteranus, as to extract from him a promise, that he would use great caution in disseminating such views. But the interest which Geisteranus felt in the subject, would not permit him to remain silent. At first he was guarded in the expression of his opinion; but he gradually threw off all reserve, and eagerly sought for opportunities of making converts.

On the 8th or 9th of March, 1619, there was a tumult at Alkmaar, occasioned by the religious differences which then existed in Holland. Geisteranus was examined respecting the cause of this tumult, and was told, that it had been the work of his party, and was the effect of what he said to his hearers. Having denied this, he was told, that, if not the effect, it was at least the event, or result of what he had said: to which he replied, in the words of the poet,

——— Careat successibus opto,
Quisquis ab eventu facta notanda putat.

He was then put upon his trial, and asked by Vincent Mousefoot, Minister of Schagen, and President of the Classis, what he thought of the Divinity of Christ, of the Holy Trinity, and of the existence of God? He demanded to know, in reply, why they put such questions to him? and was told, that, if innocent, he would not scruple to answer, because it is said by the Apostle Peter, in his first Epistle, Chap. iii. 15, “Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you.” He answered, that it was there required, that a man should be prepared to justify himself, *πρὸς ἀπολογίαν*, that is, to answer an accusation, but not to discover his

whole mind, or return an answer to every question that might be put to him; adding, however, that he was ready to enter upon his defence, whenever they chose to bring any specific charge against him. "But let it be," continued he, "as St. Paul says to Timothy, (1st Ep. v. 19,) 'before two or three witnesses.' What does it concern another person, what my private opinions are on this, or that article? I do not understand the justice of such a question. If it be to know what doctrines I teach, come to my sermons; or send somebody that may give you an account. I have preached in public, and every one was free to hear me. Let others testify what they have heard." After much parleying, he was induced to answer some of their questions, confessing his ignorance on some points, and declaring his opinion on others. Among other things, he said plainly, that no Christian Ruler, or any other person, ought to use the sword against any man; that it was not lawful for men to wage war, or to defend themselves in case war should be waged against them; and that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Being asked, whether he was not God also, and that too from all eternity? his reply was, "I cannot tell that; but the more I endeavour to find it out, and the greater diligence I use in searching into it, either in the Scriptures themselves, or the writings of expositors, the more I am bewildered in my thoughts about it." Being further interrogated, as to his opinion on the subject of the Trinity, he replied, "The Brethren may judge of that, by my former answer." "But," said they, "what do you believe concerning the Holy Ghost? Is it an operation and motion?" His reply to these, and other questions bearing upon the same point, was, "Who, my brethren, can explain to us, what is the essence of the Holy Spirit? Who can account for the essence of his own soul? Nor is it necessary to know what

the essence of the Holy Spirit is, in order to acquire the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is only represented to us by dark similitudes, of a wind, a fire, and other things. Let us, therefore, be satisfied with what the Scriptures say concerning it. A man may have a rational soul, without being able to define what it is. So it is likewise with the Holy Spirit. A man finds by his life, motions and operations, that he has a soul; and by a holy life, holy motions and operations which he finds in himself, he knows that there is a Holy Spirit. Let us, therefore, rather speak of the fruits, effects and benefits of the Holy Spirit; how they are acquired, and how preserved. This tends to edification: but the searching into inscrutable things can edify no one." He was further asked, whether he esteemed Christ to be no more than an example, or pattern, like the Socinians? To which he replied, "I hold him to be not only a pattern, but a propitiatory sacrifice."

The result of these inquisitorial proceedings was, that he was commanded to abstain from the exercise of all spiritual functions; and by the advice of his friends, he thenceforward refrained from preaching. The States of Holland and West Friesland ordered him, and his brother Peter, to retire to Gravesande, a village of South Holland, about four miles from the sea. They accordingly set out for that place; but it occurred to them, while they were on their way, that it might be the intention of their enemies to transport them to England, where they would share the same fate as Bartholomew Legate and Edward Wightman. They determined, therefore, to conceal themselves; and sent a respectful Memorial to the States, in which they assigned their reasons for not going to Gravesande, and endeavoured to establish their own innocence. The following extracts from this Memorial will serve to shew the nature of their opinions.

“As for our doctrine concerning the person of Jesus Christ, we have acknowledged, in the presence of our judges, that he is the Christ, the Son of God, and our Lord and Saviour. This is the true evangelical thesis, which contains the whole doctrine of Christians. It was proclaimed by angels; attested by the voice of God; confirmed by the miracles, death and resurrection of Christ; and preached by the Apostles. Lastly, it is by this that Christians are distinguished from all other men.—Some talk of an orthodox confession, and of a confession that is heterodox. The confession, which they call *orthodox*, is expressed in pompous words, not to be found in the Scripture; and the *heterodox* confession is made up of the very words of the Scripture.—God and Christ do not require words invented by men, but a pious and Christian life. If we are asked, Which is the best religion? we answer: That which brings forth the best fruits. The true and saving knowledge of Christ brings forth good works. ‘Hereby we do know that we know him,’ says St. John, ‘if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.’ (1 John ii. 3, 4.) St. Paul speaks the same language in his Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 20.—We maintain that Christians are justified by good works; and we are ready to shew, that by the *law* and the *works*, which St. Paul excludes in his discourse on Justification, he does not mean the precepts of the Gospel, and those good works which Christ requires from us.—”

After they had sent this Memorial to the States, John Geisteranus concealed himself at Warmond, near Leyden, where he learned and exercised the trade of a weaver, and maintained his family by the labour of his own hands. He alludes to his intention of devoting himself to some manual employment, in a letter addressed to John James F. Cod-

dæus, June 2nd, 1619; but appears at that time to have been undecided what that employment should be.

The Confession of the two brothers was read at the 138th Session of the Synod of Dort; and was declared to be Socinian and blasphemous. After this, John Geisteranus left the Remonstrants, and joined the Rhynsburgers, or Collegiants. It is said, that he consented to be re-baptized by them; and though he never spoke much at their meetings, he did all in his power, in other ways, to recommend their opinions. His reluctance to take a part in their Church meetings is sufficiently accounted for by the fact, that he was hunted after by the Government, and so closely watched, that, to prevent a surprise from his persecutors, he was obliged, whenever he worked at his loom, to creep from the garret of one house to that of another, through a hole in a party-wall, which was covered with a winnowing machine.

In the year 1620 a book was published, entitled, "A Warning to the oppressed Churches, with respect to the drawing up of a Confession." This book was without the author's name; but was supposed to have been written by John Geisteranus. The object of it was, to persuade the people, that the drawing up of a Confession was unnecessary and unscriptural, as well as inconsistent with true Christian liberty. On this occasion, the three directors of the Remonstrant body, Uitenbogaerdt, Episcopius and Grevinkhovius, addressed a letter to the Remonstrant Churches, stating that such a "Warning" had fallen into their hands; but that the author had not seen what they were preparing, and was not well informed concerning their Christian design; and that they had resolved, by God's help, to draw up such a Confession as should not be derogatory to the Word of God, or prejudicial to liberty of conscience in any way.

During the course of the year 1620, John Geisteranus was invited to settle in Poland. The situation of a Teacher in the College of Racow was offered to him by Ruarus, who then held the office of Rector in that institution; but he declined it, choosing rather to obtain a livelihood by the mechanical occupation of weaving, than engage in such an employment.

When he had been some time at Warmond, he left that place, and went to Norden, a sea-port of East Friesland, to which his brother Peter had retired. There he continued to ply the loom, and earn a subsistence for himself and his family by the labour of his own hands: but he was content, and enabled, out of his small gains, to contribute to the support of those, whose necessities were greater than his own. During the time that the plague raged at Norden, sweeping away the inhabitants of whole streets, he did not scruple to visit the sick, and even to assist in conveying the dead to their graves by night, when none could be found to render them these last offices. On the 11th of October, O. S., 1622, he was himself attacked by this complaint, and lay for several days in great agony, but always patient, and resigned to the will of God. His brother Peter was his constant attendant during this illness, and could not be prevailed upon to leave him. He retained his faculties to the last, and gently expired, breathing nothing but piety and meekness, on the 14th of October, in his thirty-sixth year. He left an only child, Evert, or Everhard, about six years old, who was likewise snatched away by the same distemper, on the 2nd of November, O. S.; as was also his widow, who, having given birth to a still-born child, expired the day after. His brother Peter, writing to their mother, says, "You have offered a son to the Lord, and we a brother; one who was not despised but by those who knew him not, and who could

never be sufficiently commended by those who knew him well." Uitenbogaerdt and Episcopius, hearing the news of his death while they were in Paris, wrote, in a certain letter, "that he was a person, who might have been very useful to the common cause, if, with the piety of his life, he had exercised more moderation in some matters, for the sake of peace and unity."

John Geisteranus was the author of

1. A Sermon on the Liberation of Alkmaar, delivered Oct. 8th, 1618;

2. *Idolelenchus*, a Poem, commonly annexed to the Hymns of Theodore Raph. Camphuysius, who translated it into Dutch Verse;

3. The Agreement of Paul and James;

4. A Confession exhibited at the Synod of Dort, April 24th, 1619;

5. On Verbal Distinctions;

6. *De Dilectione*;

7. *De Magistratu*; and

8. A Letter to John James F. Coddæus, dated June 2nd, 1619, and inserted in T. Crenius's *Animadv. Philol. et Hist. P. vii. C. iii. § x.*

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 113, 114. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 366—368. 1090. *And. Wissowatii* Narratio Compend. App. pp. 216, 217. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. in and about the Low Countries, Vol. III. Bk. xxxvii. pp. 182—198; Bk. xl. p. 283; Vol. IV. Bk. xlviii. p. 57; Bk. lii. pp. 205, 206; Bk. lviii. pp. 425—427. *De la Roche's* Abridgment, Vol. II. pp. 450—453. *Thomæ Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. vii. C. iii. pp. 200—203.

193.

PETER GEISTERANUS, (*Belg. GEESTERAN*), the brother of John, was Minister of Egmont of Zee, and Egmont Binnen. In the Acts of the Synod of Dort, the Confessions of the two brothers were read aloud, and rejected by all present, on the ground that their authors favoured the

tenets of Socinus and the Anabaptists, and endeavoured to introduce these tenets into their Churches. In these Confessions they contended for Adult, as opposed to Infant Baptism; and said, that infants were not to be baptized by any special command of God, but only for the sake of avoiding scandal. Of the Confessions both of John and Peter Geisteranus, it has been asserted, that they were corrected according to their own satisfaction: but Brandt says, that he saw a copy of the Confession of Peter Geisteranus, as it stands in the Acts of the Synod, on the margin of which he had written, with his own hand, in several places, that he had not returned such answers as were there mentioned. Opposite to other answers, says Brandt, I found, "They have suppressed the principal part of my answer." In another place; "Here they have altered my meaning, and added more than I ever spoke." Again; "This is just the reverse of what I said." And lastly, in some other places; "I confessed nothing of this."

When the two brothers separated, on their way to Gravesande, Peter retired to Norden, in East Friesland, where he was afterwards joined by his brother John, whom he survived many years. He published,

1. An Introduction to Christian Patience, in Dutch; 1644, 8vo.; 1665, 12mo.; and left behind him

2. Several Manuscript Sermons.

VIDEND. *Sandii* B. A. p. 114. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. p. 366. *Brandt's* Hist. of the Ref. &c. Vol. III. Bk. xxxvii. p. 186. *Art.* 193.

194.

JOHN CRELLIUS, (*Germ.* KRELL,) was born July 26th, O. S., 1590, on a farm, called Helmetzheim, between Nuremberg and Frankfort, and not far from the town of Kitzingen. His father, John Crellius, was a Lutheran Minister, who exercised the pastoral office during a period

of twenty years, first at Helmetzheim, where the subject of this article was born, and afterwards at Winterhausen, on the Maine. His mother, whose maiden name was Anne Grinewald, was of a good family; and a woman of singular accomplishments, and great excellence of character. Their son was blest with superior talents, and a good memory, which induced them to bestow particular attention on his education; and on the 15th of June, 1600, at the early age of ten, he was sent to a public school at Nuremberg. Here he spent three years very profitably, and succeeded in gaining the approbation of his Tutors, and his relation, John Klingius, with whom he lived, and who held the office of public Secretary. He afterwards studied two years at Stolberg am Hartz, a town of Prussian Saxony; and after spending a short time at Marienberg, in the circle of Meissen, returned, on the 27th of August, 1606, bringing back with him, from both these places, satisfactory testimonials of his proficiency and good conduct.

Crellius had now attained the age of sixteen; and his relative and patron, John Klingius, thinking him sufficiently advanced to enter upon his collegiate studies, sent him to the University of Altorf, which at that time afforded peculiar literary advantages, from the number and eminence of its Professors. Here his capacious mind ranged over the wide field of literature and science. His first care was to acquire a competent knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, and to perfect himself in the Latin. He then proceeded to study the higher branches of Philosophy; and when he had made more than common proficiency in the different branches of academical study, he turned his attention to the Scriptures.

He had become gradually more and more dissatisfied with the theological system in which he was educated, and could never thoroughly reconcile himself to some of its

doctrines ; but now, assisted by the hints which he received from Ernest Sohner, (*vide Art.* 145,) and Michael Gittichius, (*vide Art.* 168,) two of his fellow-students, he pursued his inquiries on religious subjects with greater freedom.

About the year 1610, the *Senatus Academicus* nominated him to the office of Inspector of Youth ; but this office he declined, from a deliberate conviction, that it would operate as a restraint upon the freedom of his inquiries. Some of his fellow-students, who were candidates for the same office, threw out suspicions, that he was tainted with Calvinism ; and endeavoured, by this means, to lower him in the estimation of the Senators and Curators of the University. They were not aware, that there were grounds for fixing upon him a still more unpopular name than that of *Calvinist*, and one which would have operated far more to his disadvantage. It happened, at that time, to be debated among the theological students of the University, whether Christ, as man, was an object of adoration. Crellius took the affirmative side of this question ; but some of the arguments, which he employed on this occasion, were such as the Lutherans were not in the habit of using, and were intended to serve what he esteemed a better cause than theirs. His real views, however, being known only to those, who held the same opinions as himself, he was acquitted of the charge of Calvinism ; and the Curators of the University resumed the design of making him President of the Youth, which office he again respectfully declined.

One obstruction to the wishes of Crellius was now removed, but not the fear of others ; for he had attained to that point, at which other titles of honour, customary in the Universities of Germany, awaited him, and his learning opened the way for him to various public offices, which he

nevertheless thought it his duty to avoid, as he knew that he could not accept them, without swearing to human Formularies, or Confessions of Faith. Other impediments to the enjoyment of liberty arose from the entreaties and remonstrances of his family connexions, particularly of his mother, and of that relation, whose patronage he had enjoyed from his childhood, and whose anxiety and care respecting his young protégé would seem to be rendered fruitless, if, after all, he should abandon the Lutheran Church, for which he had been expressly educated. It greatly distressed the mind of this excellent youth, to find that he could not please both God, and those friends, to whom, next to God, his attachment and obedience were due. He thought it wrong, however, to yield to man the freedom of his mind, which ought to be dedicated to God alone; and therefore came to the conclusion, that the favour or resentment of his dearest friends was, in such a case, to be disregarded, and that every objection was either to be deliberately set aside, or resolutely combated.

When he saw that he could not remain where he was, and continue to enjoy liberty of conscience, he began to consider, to what other place he could go, where he might be allowed to think as he pleased, and to give utterance to his thoughts. Poland appeared both to himself, and those of his fellow-students who enjoyed his confidence, to offer the most eligible retreat, although he had never seen that country, and knew that he had no friends there, except that he thought those might in time become his friends, who were already the friends of truth. Accordingly he left Nuremberg about the 1st of November, 1612, and travelled on foot, through the most inclement weather, and unattended by a single companion, to beguile the tedium of his journey, till he arrived at Cracow. There he was hospitably entertained by an illustrious Italian exile, John Baptist

Cettis, (*vide Art.* 161,) to whom he brought letters of recommendation from John George Leuchsner, a legal friend residing at Nuremberg. On the 13th of December, in the same year, he reached Racow, where he fixed his residence, and spent the remainder of his life.

About a fortnight after his settlement at Racow, Crellius was formally received into the communion of the Unitarian Church, and admitted to an intimate friendship with some of its most eminent Pastors. Nor did any long time elapse, before he was introduced to the Court of James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia. But he did not abuse the liberality of this Nobleman, by indulging in luxury and idleness, nor did he busy himself at all about courtly matters; but whatever time he had, (and he always had as much as he pleased,) he devoted to theological studies, to an attendance on the lectures of Valentine Smalcus, and to personal intercourse with Jerome Moscorovius, who was not less distinguished by his varied erudition, than by the attractiveness of his conversation.

In the month of May, 1613, Crellius was appointed, by a resolution of the Synod of Racow, corrector of the press for German and Latin publications, and Professor of Greek in the College of that town. He preached privately, for two years, in the German, Latin and Polish languages. In the year 1615, Smalcus introduced him in a public character; and in the month of July in that year, he preached his first sermon in the Church, in a language which was vernacular to the majority of his audience, but which he had not acquired without hard labour. In 1616, he was chosen Rector of the College. Paul Krokier, his predecessor in this office, had retired for the purpose of travelling, and was expected to resume his professional duties on his return; but failing to do this, and no person being better fitted for the vacant office than Crellius, he consented

to undertake it, and retained it for the space of five years, to his own improvement, and the public advantage.

In the same year in which he undertook the office of Rector, Crellius married Rosina, daughter of Simon Pistorius, (vide *Art.* 163,) Minister of the Church at Czarcow, by whom he had three sons, and three daughters, who survived him. The names of his sons were Theophilus, Christopher and John; of whom Christopher, the second, and John, the youngest, were not altogether unknown to fame. (Vide *Art.* 321 and 325.)

In 1621, Crellius resigned the Rectorship of the College, and resumed the ministerial character; but an infectious disease breaking out about this time, which carried off a great number of the inhabitants of Racow, he retired from the town with many others, and, during this temporary absence, prepared his celebrated work on Christian Ethics, and began his Explanations of the more difficult Passages of Scripture.

On the death of Smalcus, which took place towards the end of the same year, he was chosen colleague in the government of the Church at Racow, with his successor, Christopher Lubieniecus. It is unnecessary to follow him through the occurrences of the next ten years, during which he faithfully discharged the duties of the pastoral office. He was so assiduous in the performance of these duties, that he scarcely allowed himself lawful recreation; and his friends found it necessary to lay some restraint upon his labours. Scarcely a day passed, in which he did not preach, or was not engaged in giving advice; or administering comfort; or encouraging some to virtue; or reproving others; or clearing up some difficult passage of Scripture. These labours might have been easily discharged, by one free from other engagements. But to Crellius these duties were only a change of his usual, and daily employment. He

expounded the Scriptures to Students in Divinity; and his lectures were often attended by persons, well skilled in theological subjects, who, if the lecturer was desirous that they should renew their attendance, were not to be dismissed with trite and common-place remarks. But these hearers were so well pleased with what they learnt from Crellius, that they deemed it worthy of the public eye. Hence, whatever he expressly unfolded, or even briefly touched upon, they digested, and committed to writing on their return home. In this manner originated his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Galatians, and to the Hebrews; the former published during his life, and the latter after his death, from the notes of Schlichtingius, his colleague. The Commentary upon the two Epistles to the Thessalonians were prepared, in the same way, from notes taken by Peter Morscovius. He expounded all the other books of the New Testament in the same manner; and the Expositions were afterwards published from the notes of those who attended his class. Indeed, very few of his works were published from manuscripts, which he had drawn up with his own hand; but most of them were dictated from memory, or the suggestion of the moment, without the assistance of notes, or memoranda of any kind.

Death removed this great man, in the full vigour of his age, and amidst his varied schemes of usefulness. On the 2nd of May, 1633, when, on the festival of Whitsuntide, there were assembled, from the remotest parts, the principal members of the Unitarian Church, after having preached by request from 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, he began to complain of illness. It soon appeared, that he was seized with an infectious fever, then prevalent at Racow, with which one of his sons was at the time confined to his bed. At the beginning of his sickness, as though he had a presentiment of his approaching death, in the presence of one of his

friends, he fervently prayed to God, entreating him, with many tears, to forgive his sins, and to preserve him from the delirium attendant on that kind of fever. In the progress of his disorder, his respiration was impeded, and his articulation often rendered indistinct, by an accumulation of phlegm, with which he found it difficult to part; but his friends were able to collect, from his indistinct and broken sentences, that he was perfectly resigned to the will of God, and full of pious and holy aspirations. On the 11th of June, when there remained no prospect of a continued existence in this world, his friends assembled round his dying bed, to take their last farewell. On their entrance, he was raised up, to express, as well as he could, his gratitude for this proof of their affection, and to bestow upon them his last blessing. The whole company, including the Minister, then fell upon their knees; and, while they were engaged in the act of prayer to God, he calmly breathed his last, in the forty-third year of his age.

A short time before his death his sight began to fail, and it was resolved, by a vote of the Synod, that the Brethren should assist him in writing out his works, and, at stated hours every day, take down what he should dictate. With this view, Krzyskiewiczus was appointed, by the Synod, to act as amanuënsis to him. (Vide *Art. 259.*) This office he undertook; but as dispatch was required, he was superseded by Ruarus, whom the Racovian Elders thought better adapted for this employment than any one else.

Underneath the portrait of Crellius, prefixed to his works, are these Latin verses.

Crellius hos oculos, hæc ora modesta gerebat:

Sic animo mitis cum pietate fuit.

Hunc citò mors rapuit nimis; at per viva manebit

Scripta, quibus vivos post sua fata docet.

Hæc lege, qui mores, qui Sacra volumina nosse,

Qui cupis accenso cœlitus igne frui.

The allusions in the last distich are to his *Ethics*, his *Commentaries*, and his *Treatise on the Holy Spirit*. His works, which fill four volumes of the “*Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*,” are usually bound in three. The 1st, 2nd and 3rd comprise his exegetical, and the 4th his didactic and polemical writings. The contents of these volumes are as follow.

Vol. I.—1. Commentary on Matthew i—v. 4, dictated by Crellius. (Fol. 1—64.)

2. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, taken down by Jonas Schlichtingius from the Lectures of Crellius; but not revised by their author beyond Chap. iv. 4. (Fol. 65—202.) This Commentary and the preceding one were first printed by S. Sternacki, and published in 1636, 8vo., with a Preface by John Stoinski.

3. Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans. (Fol. 203—246.)

4. Commentary on the first ten Chapters of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, written by Crellius; and on the fifteenth Chapter, dictated by him. (Fol. 247—371.) The Commentary on 1 Cor. xv. was his last work, and was printed by Paul Sternacki, in 1635, 8vo. Crellius entered upon it, at the repeated and earnest solicitations of his friends, to give them satisfaction on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. He had begun to revise it a short time before his death.

5. Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, written down by Jonas Schlichtingius from the Lectures of Crellius. (Fol. 372—450.) This Commentary was first printed at the press of S. Sternacki, Racow, 1628, 8vo.

6. Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Galatians. (Fol. 451—471.)

7, 8. Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians; and Paraphrase on the same. (Fol. 472—500.)

9, 10. Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians; and Paraphrase on the same. (Fol. 501—524.)

11, 12. Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians; and Paraphrase on the same. (Fol. 525—543.) These three Commentaries and Paraphrases were written down from the dictation of Crellius.

13. Commentary on the first and second Epistles to the Thessalonians, (Fol. 544—604,) prepared from the Notes of Peter Morscovius, and first printed by Paul Sternacki at Racow, in 1636, 8vo.

14. Declaration of the Opinion of John Crellius on the Causes of the Death of Christ. (Fol. 605—615.) This treatise contains a summary of Crellius's answer to Grotius, and was first published at Racow in 1618, 8vo. After the author's death, it was revised by Stoinius and Schlichtingius, and published a second, and a third time, in the years 1635 and 1637. It was translated into Dutch; and mention is also made of a French translation.

Vol. II.—1. Commentary on the first Epistle of Paul to Timothy. (Fol. 1—40.) This Commentary is imperfect; but the parts which are wanting here are inserted in Vol. III.

2. Commentary on the Epistle to Titus. (Fol. 41—54.)

3. Commentary on the Epistle to Philemon. (Fol. 55—59.) These three Commentaries were taken down from the lectures of Crellius by Peter Morscovius.

4. Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Fol. 60—230.) This was the work of Schlichtingius (vide *Art.* 209, No. 4); but he says, in the Preface to the Reader, "in investigating the sense of this Epistle, Crellius was associated with me, and that too in such a way, that I am bound to ascribe the chief merit to him."

5. Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Hebrews, dictated by Crellius. (Fol. 231—267.)

6. Commentary on the first and second Chapters of the first Epistle of Peter, written out by Crellius. (Fol. 268—284.)

7. Explications of difficult Passages of the New Testament, also written out by him. (Fol. 285—321.)

8. Answers to certain Questions. (Fol. 321—327.)

Vol. III.—1. Explanation of various Passages of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke; and a great Part of that of John. (Fol. 1—122.)

2. Commentary on a great Part of the Acts of the Apostles, and numerous Passages of the Epistles of Paul; with Fragments upon the first Epistle to Timothy, which were omitted in Vol. II. (Fol. 123—264.)

3. Commentary on the second Epistle to Timothy; also upon Passages in the Catholic Epistles, and the Book of Revelation; and a Synopsis of Sermons on various Texts. (Fol. 265—416.)

Vol. IV.—1. Reply to Grotius's Work on the Satisfaction of Christ, (Fol. 1—231,) first printed at the press of Sternacki, Racow, in 1623, 4to. Subjoined to this Reply, in the Bibl. Fratr. Polon., is Grotius's own work, with two letters addressed by him to Crellius. (Fol. 232—234, 1—34.)

2. Two Books concerning the One God, the Father. (Fol. 1—110.) This treatise was first printed at Racow, by Seb. Sternacki, in 1631, 8vo. It was reprinted, with a Refutation, by John Henry Bisterfeld, at Leyden, in 1639, 4to. Wolzogenius translated it into German, in 1645, 4to. A Dutch version of it was printed at Racow, in 1649, 4to.; and an English version appeared in 1665, 4to. The latter professes to have been "printed in Kosmoburg, at the Sign of the Sun-beams." Dr. Toulmin supposes *Kosmoburg* to mean *Amsterdam* (Memoirs of F. Socinus, p. 422); but he probably had no other reason for this supposition, than

the fact, that *Cosmopoli* frequently appears on the title-pages of works, printed in that city, during the seventeenth century. A correspondent, in the *Monthly Repository*, (1808, p. 142,) says, that he has “a copy, with the title-page printed in red letters;” but in other copies the title-page is in black. A translation of this work of Crellius into Greek was repeatedly determined upon at different Synods, and sums of money were voted to defray the expense of printing it; but the design appears not to have been carried into execution.

3. A Book on God and his Attributes. (Fol. 1—116.) This valuable work was originally published, as a kind of introduction to Volkelius’s treatise “On true Religion.” Racow, Seb. Sternacki, 1630, 4to. (Vide Art. 144, No. 3.)

4. The Elements of Ethics, for the Use of Students, (Fol. 117—148,) first printed at Racow, in 1635, 8vo. This edition is extremely rare.

5. Christian Ethics, preceded by the Ethics of Aristotle, amended after the Standard of Scripture. (Fol. 149—454.) This work was begun at the desire of a noble and ingenious friend; but Crellius’s various engagements prevented him from revising and completing those notes, which were taken from his lips as he dictated, without any previous composition. In his last illness he expressed a wish that they might be transcribed. A learned friend, at the request of many, procured and collated different copies of the work, to form one that should be as correct as, under all the circumstances, it was capable of being made. Ruarus, Stoinius and Stegmann, by the direction of the Synod in 1635, had the charge of publishing it. The first edition, which was in 4to., was without date, and purports to have been printed “at Selenoburg, at the expense of the Asterii.” By *Selenoburg* is probably meant *Amsterdam*; and the *Asterii* appear to have been the brothers *Blaeu*. The

printers were John and Henry Sterns, of Lunenburg; and Curcellæus is said to have corrected the press. Another edition made its appearance in 1681, 4to. To this was prefixed a life of the author by Joachim Pistorius, M.D.; and in the same volume was printed a new edition of the Catechism of the Polish Churches, revised, amended, and illustrated with Notes, by John Crellius, Jonas Schlichtingius, Martin Ruarus, and Andrew Wissowatius. It purports to have been printed at Cosmopolis, by Eugenius Philalethes; but was really printed at Amsterdam, by Christopher Pezold.

6. A Treatise on the Holy Spirit, (Fol. 455—520,) first published at Frankfort in 1640, and afterwards in Holland, 1650, 8vo. But the place of publication is not mentioned in either of these editions. A Dutch translation of it appeared in 1664, 8vo.

7. A Vindication of Religious Liberty, (Fol. 521—532,) first published under the feigned name of *Junius Brutus Polonus*, Eleutherop. 1650, 4to., and again, 1681, 4to. A Dutch version of it appeared in 1649; and a French one by Le Cene in 1687, 12mo.

8. Problems with Solutions. (Fol. 533, 534.)

9. Extracts from Letters. (Fol. 534—542.)

10. A Treatise on Piety, (Fol. 542—551,) of which a Dutch translation was printed in 1673, 12mo., which came to a second edition in 1678, 12mo.

11. A Discourse on Happiness. (Fol. 551, 552.)

The above are all the writings of Crellius, which were inserted in the “Bibl. Fratr. Polon.” The titles of a few others, of minor importance, might perhaps be gleaned from Sandius and Bock. These consist principally of letters to his friends. He is also said to have assisted in translating the books of the New Testament into German; and to have written Latin complimentary verses to his friends,

John George Fabricius, Frauenburger, Hänlein and others, which shew that he was no contemptible Latin poet.

VIDEND. Vita Joh. Crellii Franci a *J[oa]chim* *P[istorius]*, M. D. descripta. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 115—121. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 116—158. *Toulmin's* Mem. of F. Socinus, App. ii. pp. 408—423. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. Altorf. pp. 77, 78. 188—198. *Smalcii* Diarium, A. D. 1612, apud *Zeltn.* p. 1197. *Ruari* Epist. Cent. i. N. 2. 8. 33; Cent. ii. N. 13. *T. Crenii* Anim. Philol. et Hist. P. v. C. iii. § ix. *Moreri*, Dict. Hist. Art. CRELLIUS.

195.

MARTIN RUARUS, (*Germ.* RUAR,) was a native of Krempe, in Holstein, and was born in the year 1588, or 1589. His father was Pastor of the Evangelico-Lutheran Church, and Rector of a School at Krempe. Martin was the eldest of three sons. His brother Joachim embraced the same religious views as himself; but Peter continued orthodox, and became Pastor of the Church of Breitenburg, a small town on the Stoer, near Krempe. Martin and Joachim were known by the name of *Crispici* among their Unitarian Brethren, in allusion to *Krempe*, their native town; for *Krämpeln*, in German, denotes the same as *Crispare* in Latin. Martin was called *Aretius Crispicus*, the name *Aretius* being derived from the Greek *Ἄρης*, *Mars*, and corresponding with the Christian name *Martin*. He was also familiarly known among his companions by the appellation *Martinus Noster*.

He received the rudiments of his education under Huswedel, at Hamburgh; after which he studied at Rostock and Altorf. He went to Altorf on the 16th of May, 1611, when he was twenty-two years of age; and formed there an intimate friendship with Ernest Sohner. With the exception of a short interval, which he passed at Racow, he remained at Altorf till the year 1616; and devoted himself, during the greater part of this time, to the study of Philo-

sophy and Philology. He did not pursue any exclusive course of study, but culled the flowers and fruits of literature, wherever his fancy led him. He wished it to appear, however, that the principal aim of his studies was Jurisprudence.

At first he shewed himself averse from the opinions inculcated upon him by Sohner; but at length he, with many others, gave in his adhesion to them. Yet he did not agree with his master on all points, for he was not unfrequently at a loss to know what Sohner thought; and, in fact, no one, from conversing with Sohner, or attending his lectures, could say with certainty what his opinions were.

Ruarus resolved not to connect himself with any religious body, till he had found out where the truth lay. When, by the persuasion of Conrad Rittershusius and David Hoeschelius, he was preparing to publish a translation of a certain Discourse of Gregory of Nyssa against the Arians, he wished to learn from Sohner, by what arguments he would defend the doctrine of Socinus against the Gregorian doctrine, that, if he felt able to refute these arguments, he might subjoin them, together with the refutation, to his version of Gregory's Discourse. But when he had collected, partly by means of conversation with Sohner, and partly from books supplied by him, all the materials necessary for the proposed refutation, he arrived at the conclusion, that the preponderance of scriptural evidence was in favour of the arguments, with which Sohner had supplied him; and consequently became a convert to Socinianism. The death of Sohner taking place in the year 1612, Ruarus did justice to his preceptor in a very elegant Latin poem, and became the leader of the Crypto-Socinian Church in the University of Altorf.

Leaving Altorf, with the intention of proceeding to Strasburg, accompanied by his pupil, Burghstorph, he ob-

tained from the Philosophical Faculty of Altorf an honourable testimonial, bearing date August 14th, 1614. He had before gone, unknown to all, and without even acquainting his parents and tutors with the true object of his journey, to Racow, the principal seat of Socinianism in Poland; and having contracted there an intimate friendship with the leaders of the Socinians, he returned to Altorf, and maintained so deep a silence about the matter, that scarcely any one suspected what his real motive was for visiting that country. He was more communicative, however, to his friend Joachim Peuschel, to whom, about Easter, 1614, he wrote a particular account of his journey, and the flattering reception he had met with. From his letter to this friend it appears, that, on the first celebration of the Lord's Supper after his arrival, Smalcus commended him, and the Brethren at Altorf, to all present. Immediately after this, Jerome Moscorovius, in the name of the rest, offered him a friendly welcome; and he returned thanks for these acts of kindness in an extemporaneous speech. During his stay at Racow, he was the guest of James Sieninius, Palatine of Podolia. He spent two hours daily in conversation with Smalcus, and in discussing various passages of Scripture. At these interesting meetings were present, Jerome Moscorovius, when his health would permit; Paul Krokier, Rector of the Gymnasium at Racow; and John Statorius, or Stoinski, one of the Ministers of the place. The friends of Ruarus were desirous that he should learn the Polish language; but he found it very difficult, and his disinclination to it was so great, that he made scarcely any proficiency, though he did not despair of ultimately becoming master of it. The rest of his time was fully, but agreeably and usefully employed in other ways, which, as he tells Peuschel, left him but little leisure for carrying on a correspondence with his distant friends. He returned to Nurem-

berg and Altorf early in the year 1615; and from that time became an active disseminator of his new principles. On leaving Poland, he addressed a valedictory letter to James Sieninius, in which he expressed his humble and grateful thanks for the kindness which he had received, during his residence in the mansion of that hospitable Nobleman.

It is generally thought, that Ruarus went immediately from Altorf to Strasburg: but it appears, from his own correspondence, that he was at Paris, at the beginning of the year 1616. His intimate friend, Michael Piccart, one of the Professors at Altorf, having written him word, that he was accused of being “a deserter of their sacred institutions, a sower of impiety, and a corrupter of the youth of the place,” he replied, in a letter, dated Paris, January, 1616, that he had made it his great endeavour, that no one should become worse for associating with him; and that, perhaps, the principal thing which his adversaries had to lay to his charge was, that he had opposed the corrupt manners of the times, in which he declares that he had laboured with all his might. “I rejoice,” says he, “that I have this fault, if it be one, in common with you, my friend, and with all good men, with the holy Apostles, and with my Lord and God, Jesus Christ himself.” He concludes his letter thus. “May the Lord Jesus, who is God over all, blessed for ever, pardon my dulness: to whose care I heartily commend you, my dear Piccart, and all yours.”

Vogel and Peuschel had been his intimate friends while he was at Altorf, and professed to hold the same religious views as himself; but when he was gone, and they were left to weather the storm, which had been for some time brooding, their courage failed them, and they cast all the blame upon the absent Ruarus.

Soon after his arrival at Strasburg, the Senate and University of that city received a letter from the authorities

at Nuremberg, dated April 19th, 1616, advising them to be upon their guard against a man, who had been actively instrumental in propagating heresy, and to institute an inquiry into the charge brought against him. The Senate of Strasburg commissioned John Bechtold, Professor of Theology, and John Taufner, Rector of the University, to examine Ruarus; and Zeltner has inserted their report at length, written in German, in his history of Crypto-Socialianism at Altorf (pp. 536—538). In his examination, Ruarus denied that he had ever given his assent to the opinions of Photinus; but admitted that he had, by way of exercise, proposed and defended certain doubts, during debates held in the University of Altorf, which had been the means of exciting these suspicions against him; and that M. Schopper had not replied to his arguments as he might, and ought to have done. Being asked, whether he believed Jesus to be True God? he answered in the affirmative. Being asked again, whether he believed him to be the Eternal God? he replied, that he did not deny the eternal divinity of Christ; but that he doubted it. He explained the declaration, “This is the True God and eternal life,” (1 John v. 20,) of Christ; for he said, that he had doubts, not concerning his *True*, but his *Eternal* Deity. Being asked, whether he had partaken of the Lord’s Supper at Strasburg? he answered in the negative, because he saw that wicked and impious men were allowed to partake, and did in fact partake of it. When questioned as to whether he had attempted to propagate heresy? he denied that he had; alleging, that he had never instilled his opinions into others, but had carefully kept them to himself, and would not bring any one into disgrace at Strasburg, as he was contemplating a journey into his own country, in the course of a few days. In the mean time he was deprived of his paternal inheritance in Holstein;

and the indignation of many of his former friends was excited against him.

He left Strasburg about Midsummer, 1616; and, in the autumn of the same year, John Kirchmann, of Lubeck, thus wrote to Michael Piccart respecting him. "I am sorry to hear what you say about Ruarus. He called upon me a few days ago, on his return out of Holland, where he told me that he had been sent by his pupil's guardians, to attend the funeral of Ernest Ludwig a Burghstorph, who had died during the preceding summer, and upon whom our friend, Heinsius, pronounced an elegant funeral oration. I told him exactly what I had heard about his deserting to the Photinians, and that I had not previously supposed him capable of such apostasy, but that many circumstances now induced me to give credit to the public rumours. He answered, that it was not in his power to prevent men from thinking, or speaking thus of him; but that he felt conscious of having done nothing wrong. He said, that the author of this report was a Livonian, who had been ordered by one of the Professors in the University of Königsberg to collect the arguments of the Photinians; and that he had assisted this Livonian, who now so basely insulted him. His letter, which I send you to read, induces me to give little credit to what he says. But be this as it may, the Senate of Nuremberg have acted in a proper and praiseworthy manner, in commanding wicked books of that kind to be publicly burnt by the town-crier, and the followers of this impiety to depart out of their territory. For your University had begun to get into bad repute through this name; and there were some leading men in this city, who urged this as an objection, when I once recommended some students to you. But now, I hope that the sinister report will be refuted, when this decree of your Senate shall be made known, which our

first Preacher, a short time ago, publicly quoted, in the presence of his congregation, when he became acquainted with it from your letter, which I had given him to read."

Judging from this long extract, and the tenor of Ruarus's reply to the questions put to him at Strasburg, there may be some appearance of duplicity in his conduct; but there are satisfactory reasons for supposing, that, though he had abandoned the received doctrine of the Trinity, he still believed Jesus Christ to be *True* God, though he could not allow that he was the *Eternal* God. "The reader," says the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, "will be curious to see, how Socinus maintains that the title of *true God* might be given to Christ, in his reply to some propositions which denied that title to him. '*Prop. i.* The same God whom the Hebrew Church worshiped, the Christian Church also worshipeth; namely, the Creator of heaven and earth.' *Socinus.* 'This is granted, in the plainest, and most literal acceptation of the words.' '*Prop. ii.* Since then the Hebrew Church owned him, namely, the Creator of heaven and earth, to be the only true God; so also does the Christian Church acknowledge Him to be the only true God, and none other besides him.' *Socinus.* 'If by this term, *true God*, be understood the eternal, self-existent Being, the proposition is true. But if by it be understood, one who hath a *true divine* power and dominion, it is not true. For though the Hebrew Church knew no such true God, but him who was the Creator of heaven and earth, the Christian Church acknowledges *another true God*, namely, the man Jesus of Nazareth, called the Christ, who at length, (after having been long expected,) in the reigns of the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius, was first born, exhibited, and made known to the world, and had then this *divine majesty* bestowed upon him, by the Creator of heaven and

earth.”” (*Theses de Christo a vera Divinitate excludendo, nisi sit Creator Cœli et Terræ. Socini Opera*, Vol. I. p. 285.) On this point Ruarus did no more than adopt the prevailing opinion of the Polish Unitarians.

After he left Strasburg, he made the tour of Germany, Denmark, England, Holland, Italy and France; and then proceeded into Poland. Here he was appointed companion to the sons of a gentleman, of the name of Caspar Sack, about the year 1618; and he travelled with them through Germany, Holland, England and France. He was at Leyden in that year; and the year following he spent in London. While in England, he was strongly solicited to take up his residence at Cambridge, with the promise of a Professorship, worth a hundred a-year, an establishment in one of the Colleges, and the privilege of taking pupils, which, it was calculated, would bring him in another hundred:—“a great temptation,” he writes, “to a man like me, in indigent circumstances, and one who scarcely ever felt the smiles of fortune, especially as there was a method pointed out to me, by which I might make myself easy in some measure, in point of conscience, in discharging the duties of my situation, a circumstance about which I had good reason to be alarmed. But the love of liberty got the better of all these allurements; for I saw that I must be entirely fettered in many respects, or rather, it was the love of the Best and Greatest of Beings which prevailed, whom I resolved not to serve by stealth, but ingenuously, and openly, in the face of the world.” (*Ruari Epp. Cent. i. N. 10.*)

In the autumn of 1620, he was at Frankfort on the Oder, as we learn from a letter addressed by him to Francis Limborch, in which he alludes to Volkeliuſ’s work, “*De Vera Religione*,” as a body without a head, Crellius not having then finished the Introductory Chapter, which he had en-

gaged to supply, but which did not make its appearance till ten years later.

On Ruarus's return into Poland, he resided on the estate of his patron, Caspar Sack; and Crellius resigning the office of Rector of the College at Racow, for the purpose of devoting himself exclusively to the duties of the ecclesiastical office, Ruarus was appointed his successor, in the month of May, 1621. The celebrity of this place of education was then at its height. It was frequented by several hundred youths of noble birth, many of whom were of the Evangelical and Catholic communities; and the Rectorship had been for some time an object of Ruarus's ambition. But he soon grew weary of its arduous duties, and resigned the office in 1623.

About this time an opportunity presented itself, which he gladly embraced, of accompanying on their travels Andrew Wissowatius, Joachim Pastorius, George Niemericius, Nicholas Lubieniecus, and Peter Suchodolius, with whom he visited France, Italy, Holland, England and Denmark, as well as many parts of Germany and Poland. During these travels he formed an intimacy with several of the most eminent literary characters of the day; and particularly with Grotius, who entertained a high regard for him, and with whom he ever afterwards kept up a friendly correspondence. On his return from this agreeable tour, he again took up his abode with his former patron, Caspar Sack, during his residence with whom, he made occasional excursions to distant places. In 1624, he spent some time at Dantzic. In 1627 and 1628, he visited the University of Frankfort. In 1629, he went to Bremen. In 1630, he had a pupil named Cicovius, or Cicowski; and in the same year he was employed on a mission to Dantzic. In 1631, he evinced a strong desire to settle at Dantzic; and, in the same year, he was deputed, by the Synod of Racow,

to ascertain the probability of a union of the Socinian and Remonstrant Churches, for which purpose he undertook a journey into Holland. He returned to Dantzic in the year 1632, and was present at the Synod of Racow in 1633. This was the year in which Crellius died; and Ruarus was deemed the fittest and most proper person, to carry to a conclusion the labours which Crellius had commenced. It was, therefore, decreed by the Synod, that he should come to Racow, in the course of the following winter; and that the foreign correspondence should, in the mean time, be entrusted to some one else.

Intent upon privately advancing the interests of his own Church at Dantzic, he set apart stated times for this purpose. He was in the habit of meeting, twice a week, in a social way, ten or twelve friends, of different religious persuasions, including Catholics as well as Protestants; and at these social meetings, which were held in rotation at the houses of those who attended them, any one was allowed to propose for discussion a passage of Scripture, or some controverted religious topic, and all present were permitted to express their opinions upon it, without the least restriction. By this means, each contributed his share to the common stock of information; and Ruarus insensibly won upon the good opinion of his companions, and acquired a considerable degree of influence over them, by not pressing his own views unseasonably, or offensively, and by allowing to the observations of each all the weight and importance to which they were entitled. Grotius, in a letter to Nicholas Reigersberg, dated Dec. 19th, 1637, bears testimony to the high esteem in which he was held among the members of the Reformed Church at Dantzic, on account of his mild and conciliating behaviour. But an outcry being raised against him by certain bigots, he was expelled from the city of Dantzic, and took up his abode at Strassin, a

neighbouring village, where he continued to propagate his opinions, in spite of the opposition of the Bishop of Cujavia. He was protected from persecution by the patronage of several eminent Polish Nobles, who, while differing from him on doctrinal points, respected him for his learning. His chief patron was the celebrated warrior, Stanislaus Koniecpolski, Grand General of Poland, a Roman Catholic, who procured for him, in 1643, from King Vladislav the Fourth, the diploma of a Royal Secretary, with all the privileges appertaining to that dignity, which was confirmed, through the patronage of Koniecpolski, by King John Cassimir, in 1649. The celebrated Calixtus did all in his power to convert him to the Lutheran faith, at the Conference held at Thorn in 1646, but his efforts were unattended with success.

Although Ruarus professed Socinianism with his whole soul, we nowhere read of his having been re-baptized. Nor was that deemed necessary. Hoornbeek indeed says, in his "*Summa Controversiarum*," (L. v. p. 371, Ed. 2,) "An Anabaptist is an illiterate Socinian; but a Socinian is a learned Anabaptist." Neither of these assertions, however, is true, if we take the word *Anabaptist* in its proper sense, and understand it to mean an advocate of Rebaptization. There were, in the time of Ruarus, as there are still, numerous illiterate Anabaptists, who were decidedly opposed to the doctrinal system of the Socinians; and there were also Socinians, who, though they contended that adults were the only proper subjects of Baptism, and that immersion was the only scriptural mode of administering that rite, either supposed that it was intended for none but proselytes, or that it was not meant to be observed as a standing and perpetual ordinance in the Christian Church. The Rev. Robert Robinson, who quotes this passage from Hoornbeek, says, "If he means, that all

the Baptists, though some of them do not know it, act on the principles of personal liberty, which learned Socinians have demonstrated, he says the truth." (Eccles. Res. Chap. xv. p. 596.)

Ruarus was ordained, by the imposition of hands, at the Assembly of Daszow, in 1646; and Jonas Schlichtingius, Christopher Rudnicius and Christopher Stoinius, took part in the service. From that time, as we learn from the Synodical Acts, he discharged the office of ordinary Minister among the Socinians at Dantzic; and was entitled to assume the appellation of *Reverend*. (Vide Art. 196.)

In his religious sentiments generally, Ruarus coincided with the main body of the Socinians; but he agreed with Jonas Schlichtingius, and the Remonstrants, on the subject of Christ's vicarious satisfaction, respecting which he had a friendly correspondence with Gittichius. He was favourable to the doctrine of a Millennium; and used to fast every Friday. But he strenuously opposed all, who innovated upon the Socinian system, and especially Daniel Zwicker, who urged a junction with the Hussites, and a community of goods. Subjoined to his "First Century of Letters" is a curious paper, entitled, "Martin Ruarus's Reasons, why the Members of the Church of Rome ought not to be so hostile to Unitarians, commonly called *Socinians*, or *Arians*." It was probably drawn up for the satisfaction of his Catholic friend and patron, Konickpolski; and is, on many accounts, a document worthy of preservation. The reasons assigned are eight in number, and are as follow. "i. Because *Unitarians* admit, with a sincere faith, all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, as a rule of belief, hope and practice. ii. Because they acknowledge and profess, in common with others, the Creed called the Apostles', into a confession of which alone Baptism has usually been administered by all, from ancient

times down to the present day. iii. Because the religious doctrines, which they affirm, and hold to be true, may all be expressed in the words of Scripture, and ought not to be denied by any Christian. The Romish Church, indeed, adds to these not a few, which they can neither receive, nor conscientiously acknowledge; yet their faith ought not, on that account, to be condemned as false, since it consists not of those things which they disbelieve, but of those which they believe: nor does their simplicity merit condemnation, unless any one would, for the same reason, condemn the thousands of illiterate persons within the pale of the Romish Church, who either are ignorant of many things sanctioned by the decrees of that Church, or cannot in any way receive and understand them. For a master of a family does not select from the rest of his furniture, and throw away the smaller vessels, because they are incapable of holding as much as the larger ones; and as we look upon the sun with our own eyes, and not the eyes of others, and trust to ourselves, and not to others, in what regards the sun, so we judge on other subjects according to our respective capacities, and our own estimate of what is right, and, as the case may be, approve or reject them, or hold ourselves in a state of suspense concerning them. iv. Because the Romish Church admits, that most of those articles of faith which *Unitarians* do not believe, are not expressly contained in Scripture, and deduces them either from Tradition, or the authority of Fathers and Councils; but since others, who dissent from the Church of Rome, in fixing articles of faith, reject the authority of Tradition, Councils and Fathers, equally with those who are commonly called *Unitarians*, or *Socinians*, there is no reason why that Church should be incensed against the one more than the other, although the former, it may be, on some points, contrary to their own principles, make the same

profession as the Church of Rome. v. Because *Unitarians* condemn no man for his errors alone, provided those errors do not involve the denial of a saving faith, or lead to practical impiety; and therefore are ready to fraternize with all, who believe Jesus to be the Christ, and regulate their lives according to his precepts. vi. Because they are not captious, either as regards rites which have grown up in the Church, or as respects phrases which have received the sanction of antiquity, provided only that they are allowed to interpret both according to the analogy of faith in the sacred Scriptures. vii. Because, in the leading articles of the Christian faith, they agree more nearly with the Church of Rome than with any other sect: for example, in their opinions about predestination; conditional election and reprobation; the universality of the grace of God, and the benefits arising from Christ's death; free-will, and its influence in the conversion of men to the faith; justification by love; the necessity of good works, on which they insist far more than any other Church; the possibility of keeping God's commands; the difference between the old and new covenant, and the superiority of the latter over the former, with regard both to its promises and precepts; the distinction between venial and deadly sins; and the difference between John's baptism and that of Christ. It is commonly objected to them, indeed, by way of reproach, that they do not believe the Holy Trinity; that they deny the deity of the Son of God, and his satisfaction for our sins; and that they condemn Infant Baptism. But they answer and testify, that they believe from the heart in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that they accordingly baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and acknowledge a unity in their Trinity; that they hold Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, and true God, and adore him as such; that they believe that Christ abundantly

satisfied the will of his Father in all things, which he required him to do and to suffer for our sins, and thus offered an expiation for our sins, by the sacrifice of his own body. They confess, indeed, that Infant Baptism is not enjoined in Scripture (which is acknowledged also by the Church of Rome); but they do not condemn those who practise it: they even practise it themselves in some places, in order to avoid scandal; but they do not compel any one to be baptized a second time, who has been baptized in his infancy. In those things, therefore, which they are said to deny, they acknowledge the thing itself; but they do not hold scholastic disputations about the *modus rei* of so much importance, that the unity of the faith should be destroyed on account of it. viii. Finally, because, if they err, they are ready to be set right from Scripture: and because they earnestly strive after piety towards God, charity towards their neighbours, and sobriety of life; and patiently bear all the injuries inflicted on them, by a lawful magistrate, in the name of religion."

Ruarus died about the year 1657, when he had nearly attained the age of seventy. His first wife was the daughter of Martin Voss, a merchant, of Dantzic. By her he had several children, whom he left scantily provided for. His second wife's maiden name was Catharine Weimar. She survived him; but whether he had any children by her has been doubted. Of his sons, David was brought up as a printer; Joachim became a Roman Catholic; and Martin entered the University of Königsberg as a student, July 24th, 1659, and was intended for the ministry among the Socinians. But he afterwards turned his attention to Medicine, and became a practising Chemist at Amsterdam, and a follower of Jacob Bœhmen.

Reinhart states, that Ruarus was buried at Strassin. Möller collected many eulogiums upon him, written not

only by Socinians, but by learned men of other persuasions; and Bock mentions an engraved portrait of him, underneath which was written, in an unknown hand, "*Tantæ eruditionis fuit, ut Grotium in partes Socinianorum traxerit.*"* He was one of the most learned men of his time; a fine poet, and an excellent orator, and prose writer; well versed in the Oriental dialects, and familiar with several European languages. His correspondence, which was published, and of which frequent use has been made in the course of the present work, is particularly interesting, and throws great light upon the literary and religious history of his own age.

A short time before his death, Ruarus addressed a letter to Curcellæus, thanking him for an invitation to go, and spend the remainder of his days in the city of Amsterdam. "It was a great comfort to me," says he, "that you offered me a safe asylum in your city, and I will gladly follow your advice, if matters should grow worse in this place." (Here he alludes to the calamities occasioned by the Swedish war.) "In the mean while, as long as any hope of more peaceful times remains, I will not remove hence to such a distance, on slight grounds, particularly with my numerous family. Nor do I think it right to leave the care of the Churches in these parts, as long as I can maintain my ground; or to exchange my mode of living, which is tolerable here, for your too expensive one. For although, by the blessing of the immortal God, I have wherewith to support myself and my family for a time, yet my means would soon fail, if I could obtain assistance from no other quarter; and though, at the age of sixty-eight, I cannot have long to live, yet it would evince a want of feeling, if I were to consume the whole of my patrimony during my own life, and afterwards leave my wife, and so many children, to the mercy of strangers in a foreign land. It cannot reasonably

be expected, on account of my hated name, which all men will abhor, that I should there gain anything by my literary labours, for which, by the grace of God, I have sufficient strength still left: yet my foolish parents gave me some knowledge of letters, nor have I learnt any other art; and at my age it is too late to begin. My son-in-law, J. S., (vide *Art.* 318,) by God's blessing, enjoys good health, and lives under the same roof with me; but the iniquity of the times has reduced him also to no small straits, for during two years and a half which he has been here, the salary in vain promised him from Poland still remains unpaid."

Ruarus's pen was constantly employed, in the service of the religious body to which he belonged. The following is an account of his writings, published and unpublished, taken chiefly from Bock.

1. A Century of Select Letters of Martin Ruarus, and also of H. Grotius, M. Mersennus, M. Gittichius, Næranus, and other learned Men, &c. Amst. David Crispicius (Ruarus), 1677, 8vo. Another Century was afterwards published at the same place, by David Ruarus; 1681, 8vo. Ruarus is better known by these two Centuries of Epistles, than by any other of his published writings. They were collected by his sons from his extensive correspondence; and published, as the dates shew, after his death. To the former of the two Volumes was prefixed a Preface by his son, Joachim Ruarus, who was the author of some original poems in the Dutch language, on the internal worship of God. The Preface to the latter Volume was supplied by David Ruarus, the printer, another of his sons. A second edition of these Letters, with Notes, was published by Zeltner, at Leipzig, in 1729, by way of Supplement to that writer's "History of Crypto-Socinianism at Altorf." To the first Century were annexed

2. A Paper on Magistracy, by way of reply, as is sup-

posed, to a Letter of Daniel Brenius, dated Amsterdam, August 26th, 1627; and

3. Reasons why the Members of the Church of Rome ought not to be so hostile to Unitarians, commonly called *Socinians*, or *Arians*. These "Reasons" are included by Sandius in a list of anonymous writings, and represented as still remaining in manuscript, (B. A. p. 178,) although he had previously alluded to them, as published in 1677 (p. 114).

4. Notes on the Catechism of the Polish Churches, about twenty of which were inserted in the editions of 1665 and 1680. The rest remained unpublished. The editors, Andrew Wissowatius and Joachim Stegmann, Jun., speaking of Ruarus, in connexion with John Crellius and Jonas Schlichtingius, describe him as one of the chief luminaries of their Church. (Vide "The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, translated from the Latin, by Thomas Rees, F.S.A. Lond. 1818," p. civ.; and General Index, *Ruarus*, p. 401.)

5. A Confession respecting the Doctrine of Satisfaction, with Annotations of Peter Zornius. *MS.*

6. Analyses, or Discourses on various Passages of Scripture. *MS.*

7. A History of his own Time. *MS.*

8. A Book of Extracts. *MS.*

9. On the Obedience of a Christian Man. *MS.*

10. Conferences held at Berlin with Paul Felgenhauer, in 1629; and mentioned by that writer in his "Refut. Paralogismorum Socinian." p. 108.

11. Contributions to a German Version of the Books of the New Testament, which was published in 1630.

12. A Letter to Ganovius, of Königsberg.

13. A Friendly Disputation against the Jews, containing an Examination of a certain Jewish Writing, translated

from Portuguese into Latin, and an Answer to certain Questions therein proposed to Christians. 1644, 4to. Sandius attributes this Disputation to Daniel Brenius (B. A. p. 136); but, in so doing, Bock supposes him to have been altogether mistaken. (Hist. Ant. T. I. P. ii. p. 732.) Reinhart is of opinion, that Martin Ruarus was the author. (Vide *Art.* 223, No. 4, h.) It was translated into Dutch by J. F. Oudaan, and published at Amsterdam, in 1664, 4to. (Vide Sandii B. A. p. 137.)

14. Two Letters of Ruarus to George Richter, Advocate of Nuremberg.

15. A brief Explanation of the first Chapter of John, in German. We learn from the Acts of the Synod of Racow, A.D. 1635, that Ruarus wrote this "Explanation."

16. A Translation of Four Letters of Faustus Socinus to Andrew Dudithius from Italian into Latin. Racow, 1635.

17. On Alms. This was written in German; and is referred to by Ruarus himself, in a letter to Zwicker.

18. Latin Poems. Möller mentions these, and praises them; as well as a German Poem by Ruarus, in Alexandrine verse, which was subjoined to Henry Hudemann's "German Emblems," under the title, "Des Hirnschleiffers." 1626, 8vo.

19. A Reply to John Botsaccus, a Dantzic Divine. Ruarus mentions this himself, Epp. Cent. ii. N. 98.

20. A Dissertation on the Word of God. Irenopolis, 1646, 8vo.

In addition to the above, Ruarus was engaged in works, in which his name does not appear; and he was commissioned, and requested to write others, which, from various causes, he was unable, in some cases, to undertake, and in others to complete. In conjunction with John Stoinius and Joachim Stegmann, he superintended the publication

of John Crellius's posthumous works, which were finished in 1656, the year before his own death. He held out a hope to his patron, Stanislaüs Koniecpolski, General in Chief of the armies of the King of Poland, that he would write A History of the Scythian War, which was brought to a successful issue by this able commander, who routed and put to flight thirty thousand Tartars. Ruarus likewise contemplated a new edition of Gregory of Nyssa's *Λόγος Κατηχητικός*. It further appears, from the Synodical Acts of 1629, that he was employed in compiling A Theological Lexicon. To him also was entrusted the revision of the "Triadomachia," as appears from the Synodical Acts of 1633. At the Synod of Racow, A.D. 1637, he was invited to prepare An Explanation of the Confession of the Unitarian Churches; and at the Assembly of Czarcow, in 1652, he was commissioned to write On the Mode of forming a Union with the Evangelicals.

VIDEND. *Ruari* Epist. *passim*. Epp. Remonstrantium, N. 609. *Sandii* B. A. pp. 114, 115. *Bock*, Hist. Ant. T. I. pp. 713—735. *Bayle*, Dict. Hist. et Crit. Art. RUARUS. *Zeltneri* Hist. Crypto-Socin. pp. 42—45. 55. 78. 93—95. 100—149. 316—329. 388—392. 534—539. Suppl. p. 1231. *Thomæ Crenii* Animadv. Philol. et Hist. P. v. p. ult. *Lindsey's* Hist. View, Chap. vi. Sect. iv. pp. 388—394. *Krasinski's* Hist. Sketch of the Ref. in Poland, Vol. II. Chap. xiv. pp. 381, 382. *Schelhornii* Amæn. Liter. T. IV. pp. 529, 530, etc.

HACKNEY :
PRINTED BY C. GREEN.



Princeton Theological Seminary

1 1012 01206 9557

[illegible]

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



